DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 477 SO 016 277

AUTHOR Downey, Matthew T., Ed.
TITLE History in the Schools. National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin 74.
INSTITUTION National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-87986-049-9
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 66p.; Based on 4 papers presented at the Boston Conference on the Status of History in the Schools (Boston, MA, November 22, 1982). Publication sponsored by the Special Interest Group for History Teachers.
AVAILABLE FROM National Council for the Social Studies, 3501 Newark St., N.W., Washington, DC 20016 ($5.95 plus postage).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Educational History; Educational Needs; *Educational Practices; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *History Instruction; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Materials; Public Schools; *Social Studies; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods; Textbooks

ABSTRACT

This examination of the condition of history instruction in the public schools offers chapters on four major areas of concern to educators: (1) the status of history in the schools; (2) problem areas in the history curriculum; (3) students, methods, and instructional materials; and (4) preparation and certification of history teachers. In the first chapter, Matthew T. Downey reviews the status of history in the curriculum as it has evolved over the years and concludes that although history remains a dominant subject in the social studies curriculum, patterns of enrollment and course offerings change from time to time. In Chapter 2, Douglas D. Alder and Matthew T. Downey discuss major challenges facing those concerned with history in the schools, especially the importance of restoring world history to its former place in the high school curriculum and U.S. history to the junior high curriculum. In chapter 3, Hazel W. Hertzberg recommends that future improvement in the teaching of history will be based on strengthening the link between purpose, content, method, and materials of instruction with each other and with the developmental needs and capacities of students. The chapter then discusses aspects of examining change through time, characteristics of historical inquiry, research on adolescent conceptualization of historical time, the value of active participatory learning, and the need for better materials. In the final chapter, Clair W. Keller presents recommendations for teacher preparation, certification, inservice education, and master's degree requirements. (LH)

ED254477

MATTHEW T. DOWNEY,
EDITOR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCSS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 016 277

History in the Schools

Matthew T. Downey
Editor

Sponsored by the
National Council for the Social Studies
Special Interest Group for History Teachers
Bulletin No. 74

National Council for the Social Studies

President
Donald H. Bragaw
New York State Department of Education
Albany, New York

President-Elect
Paul R. Shires
Glendale-Nicolet High School
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Vice President
Jan Tucker
Florida International University
Miami, Florida

Executive Director
Frances Haley
Washington, DC

Director of Publications
Charles R. Rivera
Washington, DC

Executive Secretary Emeritus
Merrill F. Hartshorn
Washington, DC

Board of Directors
Charlotte C. Anderson
Virginia A. Atwood
Janna Bremer
Phyllis Clarke
Jean Craven
Lois W. Daniel
Betty S. Dean
Robert Dilzer, Jr.
Carole L. Hahn
Jean Hutt
Shirley J. Johnson
Clair Keller
Bob Lynch
Mary McFarland
Debra J. Miller
Helen Richardson
Bob Stahl
Ex Officio
Frederick Green

Publications Board
Caroline Penn, *Chairperson*
David Naylor
Denny Schillings
Ann Stoddard
Thomas Turner
Linda Wojtan
Ex officio:
Jan Tucker
Judith S. Wooster
Frances Haley
Charles R. Rivera

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 84-063085
ISBN 0-87986-049-9
Copyright© 1985 by the
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES
3501 Newark Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016

Table of Contents

Contributors iv

Preface v

Introduction
Richard Ekman viii

Chapter 1: The Status of History in the Schools
Matthew T. Downey 1

Chapter 2: Problem Areas in the History Curriculum
Douglas D. Alder and Matthew T. Downey 13

Chapter 3: Students, Methods and Materials of Instruction
Hazel W. Hertzberg 25

Chapter 4: Preparation and Certification of History Teachers
Clair W. Keller 41

Index 52

Contributors

Douglas D. Alder is Professor of History and Director of the Honors Program at Utah State University. He has served on the Board of Directors of the Social Science Education Consortium and is currently on the Advisory Board of *The History Teacher*. Professor Alder has published articles on history teaching in *Social Education*, *The History Teacher*, *Teaching History* and *Network News Exchange*. A number of his articles on the First Austrian Republic have appeared in historical journals. In 1984 Professor Alder chaired a conference on Teaching Controversial Subjects in the Social Studies Classroom at Irsee, Germany, sponsored jointly by the Social Science Education Consortium and the Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung.

Matthew T. Downey is Professor of History at the University of Colorado in Boulder. He has published extensively on history and social studies education and co-authored *Using Local History in the Classroom* (1982), published by the American Association for State and Local History. He also served as editor of the NCSS Bulletin, *Teaching American History: New Directions* (1982), and has been a member of the Advisory Board of *The History Teacher* and the Editorial Boards of *Social Education* and *Teaching History*. He is a member of the National Council for the Social Studies and in 1977 helped to organize within NCSS the Special Interest Group for History Teachers.

Hazel Whitman Hertzberg is Professor of History and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. A former junior high school teacher of social studies and English, she has written extensively in social studies education and American Indian history. Her publications include *Teaching the Age of Homespun* (1963), *Teaching a Pre-Columbian Culture: The Iroquois* (1966), *The Great Tree and the Longhouse: The Culture of the Iroquois* (1966), *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (1971), "The Teaching of History," in Michael Kammen (ed.) *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States* (1980), and *Social Studies Reform, 1880–1980* (1981). Professor Hertzberg is currently working on a history of the social studies in United States public secondary schools, for which she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship (1983–1984) and a Fellowship at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (1984).

Clair W. Keller is Professor of History and Secondary Education at Iowa State University where his duties include teaching history courses and supervising student teachers. His publications include *Involving Students in the New Social Studies* (1972) and *Freedom's Trail* (1979), an eighth-grade United States history textbook which he co-authored. Professor Keller has also written numerous articles on history and social studies teaching, which have appeared in *Social Education*, *The History Teacher*, and other professional journals. He currently serves as a Director of the National Council for the Social Studies and chairs the Organization of American Historians Committee on Teaching in Schools and Colleges.

Preface

This report began in the summer of 1982, a time that seemed propitious for examining the status of history in the public schools. Nearly a decade had passed since the information was gathered for Richard Kirkendall's report, which was then the most recent attempt to find out how history was faring in the school curriculum.[1] The National Endowment for the Humanities provided an opportunity to review the situation by offering to support a one-day conference that fall in conjunction with the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies. To help focus discussion at the conference, the four contributors to this report prepared preliminary draft papers on various aspects of the question. The conference took place November 22, 1982, at the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, sponsored by an NCSS affiliate, the Special Interest Group for History Teachers (SIGHT). It was attended by 30 individuals from quite diverse backgrounds who shared a common concern about the welfare of history in the schools. With the benefit of their advice, the authors set to work again on the draft papers, which evolved into the chapters of this report.

The authors set out to provide at least tentative answers to a series of questions. How was history faring in the schools? How well was it being taught in the school classrooms? What were the teacher-training institutions and state accrediting agencies providing and prescribing for history teachers in the way of training? To answer those questions, the authors had to depend almost entirely on previously published information. Unable to find even published information on the status of world history, Douglas D. Alder sent a brief questionnaire to social studies specialists in state departments of education. But even a modest effort to gather new data from the schools was beyond the reach of the project, which was funded only by the small budget provided by NEH for a history teachers' conference. While this constraint placed obvious limitations on the authors, it provided them with a perspective that might otherwise have been neglected.

With little current data available from the schools, the authors had to concentrate less on the present and more on the enduring issues, practices and problems of history education. The kind of information

[1]Richard S. Kirkendall, "The Status of History in the Schools," *The Journal of American History*, LXII (September 1975), 557–570.

available prompted them to become more historical in their approach, an appropriate perspective for a report on the teaching of history.

The authors were also asked to recommend future actions to strengthen the position and improve the teaching of history in the schools. They have done so. But the authors have approached this part of their task in much the same spirit that guided the American Historical Association's Committee of Seven, when it published a set of recommendations for the schools more than 80 years ago. "When all is said and done," the Committee noted, "only so much will be adopted as appeals to the sense and judgment of the secondary teachers and superintendents; and that any rigid list of requirements, or any body of preemptory demands, however judiciously framed, not only would but should, be disregarded in schools whose local conditions make it unwise to accept them."[2] That is a fitting approach to educational reform of any kind.

The authors would like to thank the 1982 Boston conference participants for their many helpful suggestions, especially those who read and criticized successive drafts of the report. The following people took part in the Boston Conference on the Status of History in the Schools:

Douglas D. Alder, Department of History, Utah State University
Joseph D. Baca, State Department of Education, New Mexico
Lois J. Barnes, Western Hills High School, Frankfort, Kentucky
William T. Cleveland, Bethlehem Central High School, Delmar, New York
Gerald Danzer, Department of History, University of Illinois, Chicago
Matthew T. Downey, Department of History, University of Colorado at Boulder
Wayne Dumas, School of Education, University of Missouri
Catherine Edwards, Boulder High School, Boulder, Colorado
Roy Erickson, San Juan Unified School District, Carmichael, California
James Herbert, The College Board, New York
Hazel W. Hertzberg, Department of Social Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University
Clair W. Keller, Department of History, Iowa State University
Richard Kirkendall, Department of History, Iowa State University
Everett Kline, Columbia High School, Maplewood, New Jersey

[2]American Historical Association, Committee of Seven, *The Study of History in Schools* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899), 4–5.

Tedd Levy, Nathan Hale Middle School, Norwalk, Connecticut
Myron Marty, Division of Education Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C.
Fay Metcalf, Boulder High School, Boulder, Colorado
Louis J. Nicolosi, Department of Education, Louisiana
Patricia O'Connell, Department of Education and Cultural Services, Maine
Peter O'Connell, Museum Education Department, Old Sturbridge Village, Sturbridge, Massachusetts
Francis Roberts, Elementary and Secondary Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C.
D. L. Schillings, Homewood-Flossmoor High School, Flossmoor, Illinois
Robert V. Schnucker, Department of Religion and Philosophy, Northeast Missouri State University
Valerie Seaberg, Department of Education and Cultural Services, Maine
Hilda Smith, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
Lawana Trout, Center for the History of the American Indian, Newberry Library
Elvin Tyrone, Texas Education Agency
David D. Van Tassel, Department of History, Case Western Reserve University
Thomas Weible, School of Education, University of Missouri
Jamil S. Zainaldin, American Historical Association

Although the conference participants provided invaluable advice and information, they are in no way responsible for the conclusions expressed in this report. The authors claim sole responsibility for errors of fact and for interpretation of data. The opinions and judgments expressed are theirs alone. The essays in this volume do not constitute a statement of position by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Introduction

The status of history instruction has become an increasingly important topic in the current national debate over the means to revitalize education in the United States. Many of the recent reports on schools have highlighted the paradoxical position of history in the curriculum: although many of the 50 state governments require students to take more courses in history and social studies than in science or mathematics (and there is evidence that the number of high school students who study United States history has increased faster than school enrollments overall), the status of history is perhaps more problematic now than it was a few decades ago. Some states no longer require courses in United States history for high school graduation. Other states and local school districts have replaced traditional survey courses on U.S. and European history with an array of electives on topics or themes that resonate with current fashion or events, but have no other rationale. Moreover, many high school students, surveys sadly document, believe history and social studies courses are far less interesting than other subjects they study. The conclusion seems unavoidable that the teaching of history in the schools is in a state of flux.

Not all is bleak on the landscape of education, however. Several states have recently made efforts to restore history to a central place in the schools, California's CLIO project being a notable example. Throughout the nation, college and university historians have begun to recognize that they can help improve history's fortunes. Their concern is reflected in new requirements for college freshman courses, such as that of Bethany College in early modern European history; new entrance requirements for college admission, such as those adopted by twelve independent Pennsylvania colleges; and new efforts to work with teachers in institutes that provide the opportunities for them to deepen their understanding of the subjects they teach, such as the history institute at Central Michigan University. These are among the many efforts likely to bear fruit over the next few years.

Most noteworthy have been recent efforts to re-derive the rationale for including history in the school curriculum: a recent conference at Columbia University focusing on the place of Asia in undergraduate general education programs; a conference at Michigan State University addressing the vexing "world civilization" versus "Western civilization" question; and a series of conferences sponsored by the American Historical Association dealing with the place of the United States Constitution in high school U.S. history courses. These are typical of the more sophisticated conceptualizations of the problem of history's status that are now, at last, making their way into the forefront of the national debate.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has been involved in several of these ventures and in 1982 asked Matthew T. Downey of the University of Colorado at Boulder to spearhead an effort to assess the state of history in the schools. Downey, a United States historian with a continuing interest in secondary education, was well qualified to undertake the project. Downey had helped found the Special Interest Group for History Teachers, an ad hoc group that hopes to bridge the gap that has grown up over the years between those who think of their profession as "history" and those who think of it as "social studies." With the support of the American Historical Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, Downey organized a conference on the status of history in the schools held in Boston on November 22, 1982. The conference and its materials provide the foundation for *History in the Schools*.

Since its founding in 1965, the Endowment has always been interested in improving the status of history in the schools. This project represents no change in Endowment policy. Since 1982, however, the Endowment has shifted the emphasis of its education programs away from a concern merely to enrich the curriculum and toward a concern to bolster the commonly taught subjects of the curriculum. The Endowment has tried energetically to reinforce the stated priorities of the schools by working through principals, superintendents, school boards and others, rather than further weaken reform efforts through a more diffuse approach to its grants. Endowment-supported residential institutes and seminars provide elementary and secondary teachers and administrators the opportunity to examine important ideas, topics and texts, as well as the most effective ways to teach them. Through collaborative projects, the Endowment supports efforts to aid schools that wish to establish a systematic and sustained relationship with nearby colleges and universities in order to improve

education in the humanities at all the collaborating institutions. In 1982 the Endowment also launched a new program of summer fellowships for independent study by secondary school teachers, and in 1983 it established a mechanism to help colleges and universities strengthen their preparatory programs for students who intend teaching careers in the humanities. In short, *History in the Schools* is one part of a multifaceted approach to improve humanities education.

The subject of history, the organizers of this project cogently argue, should be restored as an integral part of the school curriculum because it is central to all fields of the humanities. Students should understand the importance of learning from primary sources. They should know that some topics and issues are more important and enduring than others. State boards of education, colleges of education and school systems all need to recognize that effective history teachers are those who have thoroughly mastered the subject matter in a way that enables them to teach their courses confidently. The study of history is important, they argue, precisely because it helps students simultaneously understand their intellectual inheritance and their civic responsibilities.

Fortunately *History in the Schools* does more than exhort us to be more cognizant of the importance of history. As Matthew T. Downey recognizes, those of us concerned with the status of history ought to be well past the finger-wagging stage. *History in the Schools*, rather, contributes to the important effort to provide a better rationale for including history in the curriculum. It also explores a number of ways to present historical material to students and warns us against common presentist fallacies. Matthew T. Downey, Douglas D. Alder, Hazel W. Hertzberg and Clair W. Keller deserve our thanks for their contribution to the ongoing discussion.

Richard Ekman, Director
Division of Educational Programs
National Endowment for the Humanities

CHAPTER 1

The Status of History In the Schools

MATTHEW T. DOWNEY

How is history faring in the schools? While always an important question to those concerned about social studies education, it has assumed a broader relevance today as education in the United States undergoes more critical examination and evaluation. History and a cluster of related social studies subjects occupy a prominent place in the school curriculum. More states require the teaching of social studies than of either mathematics or science in the secondary schools.[1] Each year several million students are enrolled in history courses in the schools.[2] These classes occupy much of the working day of the majority of the estimated 150,000 to 200,000 social studies teachers in the United States.[3] History education is a major enterprise in the public schools, consuming substantial time and money. Its status should be of more than passing interest to anyone concerned about the state of public school education in the United States.

The condition of history in the schools has not escaped attention

[1]Iris R. Weiss, *National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education* (Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1978), 24.

[2]A study by the National Center for Education Statistics reported that some 9.5 million secondary school students were enrolled in history courses during the school year 1972–73. Logan C. Osterndorf and Paul J. Horn, *Course Offerings, Enrollments, and Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972–73.* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1976), 35. In addition, several million students study history each year at the elementary level.

[3]The estimate of the number of social studies teachers is from Mary Vann Eslinger and Douglas P. Superka, "Social Studies Teachers," *The Current State of Social Studies: A Report of Project SPAN* (Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium, 1982), 167.

in recent years. In 1975 Richard Kirkendall, executive secretary of the Organization of American Historians, issued a report on the status of school history.[4] Kirkendall concluded that history in the schools stood in a state of crisis and in serious danger of being displaced by other social studies subjects. A second report published in 1982 by the Council for Basic Education endorsed that conclusion and emphasized the importance of regaining the ground that history had supposedly lost.[5] Neither report told us as much as we would like to have known about either the status of history in the schools or the nature of the difficulties facing it. Neither report was based on systematically collected evidence about history enrollments and course offerings. While they represent commendable efforts to call attention to the importance of history as a school subject, the reports did not probe deeply enough into the status of history in the school curriculum.

Although no agency has regularly collected data about history enrollments and offerings, a substantial body of information has accumulated over the years. In 1979 the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) published a national survey of science, mathematics and social studies education, containing information about the status of history.[6] (This study had not been published when the Kirkendall report was issued and was not consulted by the committee that produced the Council on Basic Education's report.) Although some state surveys have been undertaken since 1979, the RTI study is the most recent national study. A somewhat earlier report of school enrollments and course offerings was published in 1976 by the National Center for Education Statistics, and it, too, contains information about history enrollments.[7] By linking data from the 1970s with that produced by still earlier surveys, some tentative conclusions can be made about general trends and directions of change in the place of history in the public school curriculum.[8]

So far as enrollments and course offerings are concerned, U.S. history has in recent years remained solidly entrenched in the high

[4]Richard S. Kirkendall, "The Status of History in the Schools," *The Journal of American History*, LXII (September 1975), 557–570.

[5]James Howard and Thomas Mendenhall, *Making History Come Alive: The Place of History in the Schools* (Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 1982).

[6]Weiss, *National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education*.

[7]Osterndorf and Horn, *Course Offerings, Enrollments, and Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972–73*, 35.

[8]Among the most valuable of the earlier surveys are Scarvia B. Anderson et al., *Social Studies in Secondary Schools: A Survey of Courses and Practices* (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1964); Willis D. Moreland, "Curriculum Trends in the Social Studies," *Social Education*, 26 (1962), 73–76; and Howard R. Anderson, *Teaching of United States History in Public High Schools: An Inquiry into Offerings and Registrations, 1946–1947*, Bulletin, 1949, No. 7 (Washington, DC: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, 1949).

schools of the United States. The RTI survey reported that in 1977 United States history was required in 81 percent of the nation's school districts and was offered as an independent subject in at least 93 percent of the schools. The survey concluded that "it is likely that the remaining 7 percent include American history content in other courses such as 'social studies.'"[9] Enrollments in the high school U.S. history course far exceeded the number enrolled in any other social studies course at that level. Although more recent data is sketchy, state surveys conducted in Arkansas, Iowa, Montana and West Virginia did not indicate any major change in the status of U.S. history in those states in the years immediately following the RTI study.[10]

While U.S. history seems in no danger of being displaced from the high school curriculum, it does not enjoy the privileged position it once held. It is less widely required than it was forty years ago for high school graduation by state law or by state department of education policy. In a survey conducted for the United States Office of Education in 1946–47, Howard Anderson found that virtually every high school included in his sample required a year of U.S. history. He concluded that the course owed its entrenched position to a variety of legislative, state department of education and local requirements.[11] By 1954 all but one of the 48 states required the teaching of U.S. history in the secondary schools.[12] That is no longer the case. Two recent surveys of state curriculum requirements indicate that only about 75 percent of the states require a course in United States history for high school graduation.[13]

Is the decline in state requirements a threat to the status of U.S. history in the schools? Not necessarily. Local school boards can and do establish history requirements in lieu of state action. Comparing social studies enrollments for 1961 and 1973, Richard Gross found that enrollments in United States history courses in the high schools had increased by 74 percent, while total high school enrollments had

---

[9]Weiss, *National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education*, 26, 54.

[10]Patricia Betts Roach, "Social Studies Curriculum in the State of Arkansas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1981; William E. Carroll et al., "The Teaching of History in the Public High Schools of Iowa," unpublished report, August 1979; Harold Joseph Stearns, "American History in Montana High Schools: Past and Present," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, 1978; Lydia L. McCue and John Willis, "1981 Social Studies Curriculum Survey, Summative Report," The Social Studies Curriculum Task Force, West Virginia Board of Education, August 13, 1981.

[11]Howard R. Anderson, *Teaching of United States History in Public High Schools*, 4, 12.

[12]William H. Cartwright, "What Is Happening in the Social Studies," *Social Education*, 18 (February 1954), 77.

[13]Jeri Sutton, *National Survey, Social Studies Education, Kindergarten–Grade Twelve* (Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Education, 1976); Hilda L. Smith et al., *Humanities and State Education Agencies: Policies, Perspectives and Prospects* (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1983), 24–30.

grown by only 59 percent.[14] That growth had taken place despite a decline in the number of state-mandated history requirements for high school graduation. One must also keep in perspective the nearly universal U.S. history requirement of the 1940s and 1950s. It was a relatively recent development, probably a result of the patriotic fervor of the World War II years. The existing and more relaxed attitude toward state requirements may, in fact, be closer to the long-term norm.

While United States history has at least held its own in the high schools, in recent years it has been losing ground in the junior high schools where it was once a nearly universal requirement. In the schools surveyed by Howard Anderson in 1946–1947, nearly all the junior high students were enrolled in a U.S. history course. It was a required course in 90 percent of those schools.[15] Subsequent studies, however, indicate a gradual and persistent decline in requirements, courses and enrollments.

The decline of U.S. history in the junior high schools was well under way by the early 1960s. A 1963 study by Scarvia Anderson reported that only 75 percent of the schools in a national sample offered a United States history course at the junior high level, while another 13 percent taught it in combination with some other course.[16] The number of schools requiring the course had also dropped, according to a 1962 study by Willis D. Moreland. He found that only 47 percent of 281 secondary schools in his sample required United States history at the eighth grade, while an additional 24 percent required it in combination with other subjects, usually geography, civics or state history.[17] The enrollment data in the RTI study suggests that a substantially smaller number of students in 1977 took United States history courses at the junior high level than in the senior high schools.[18] Evidence of U.S. history's continued decline in the junior high schools was also found by Karen B. Wiley in her 1977 examination of social studies literature. She concluded that "many states, in order to avoid repetition, have eliminated the American history course at the junior high level and now only teach it once at the secondary level,

[14]Richard E. Gross, "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," *Social Education*, 41 (March 1977), 196.

[15]Howard R. Anderson, *Teaching of United States History in Public High Schools*, 5, 19.

[16]Scarvia B. Anderson et al., *Social Studies in Secondary Schools: A Survey of Courses and Practices* (Princeton, NJ: Cooperative Testing Division, Educational Testing Service, 1964), 12.

[17]Moreland, "Current Trends in the Social Studies," 74.

[18]Weiss, *National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education*, 60.

usually in the 11th grade."[19] The concern about repetition of course content probably is the major reason for the apparent decline of U.S. history in the junior high schools.

United States history is also taught at the elementary level, usually at the fifth grade, frequently in combination with other social studies subjects. Judging from a sample of the textbooks available for that course, history is often combined with geography.[20] Many textbooks also include material on other Western Hemisphere countries besides the United States. Chapters on "America's neighbors" usually include material on the physical geography and natural resources of Canada, Mexico and the nations of Central and South America as well as an overview of their histories. The varied content of these textbooks, with sometimes 25 to 50 percent of the pages devoted to matters other than United States history, suggests that the fifth-grade course varies considerably from school to school. Wiley concluded that the course is also probably more "presentist" than was once the case, which may very well be true.[21] But the place in the curriculum of this combined history-social studies course seems to be reasonably secure.

Perhaps the most surprising development in the elementary history curriculum is the apparent increase in time devoted to state history. In a study of changes in the social studies curriculum completed in 1964, Bernice Stiles Wade found a trend toward the greater emphasis on state history at grade four.[22] Wiley noted in 1977 that state history had become the principal fourth-grade social studies course in many districts, displacing the traditional course that emphasized regions of the United States.[23] Although some districts may still be offering state history at the eighth grade as well, this presumably represents a course shift downward to the fourth grade.

---

[19]Karen B. Wiley, *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955–1975* (Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1977), 33. Although most of the data indicates a decline in United States history in the junior high schools, there is some contrary evidence. A report by Lynn Fontana reported that as many sections of U.S. history were offered at grades seven through nine as at grades ten through twelve; Lynn Fontana, *Status of Social Studies Teaching Practices in Secondary Schools*, Research Report No. 79 (Bloomington, IN.: Agency for Instructional Television, 1980), 35, as reported in James G. Lengel and Douglas P. Superka, "Curriculum Organization in Social Studies," *The Current State of Social Studies: A Report of Project SPAN* (Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium, 1982), 93.

[20]The elementary textbooks consulted by the author included Gertrude Stephens Brown, with Ernest W. Tiegs and Fay Adams, *The Country* (Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company, 1983); Allen Y. King, Ida Dennis and Florence Potter, *The United States and Other Americas* (New York: Macmillan, 1982); Timothy M. Helmus, Val E. Arnsdorf, Edgar A. Toppin and Norman J. G. Pounds, *The United States and Its Neighbors* (Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett, 1984).

[21]Wiley, *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education*, 30.

[22]Bernice Stiles Wade, "A Study of Recent Changes in the Social Studies Program of the Public Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1964, 134.

[23]Wiley, *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education*, 30.

A sampling of some recently published materials for state history suggests that the subject may be undergoing a substantial redefinition. At one time, state history tended to be narrowly construed as the study of the state constitution and political history of the state.[24] The social and cultural history approach of some recent materials makes state history a vehicle for more intensive study of social developments with broad historical significance.[25] In that guise, state history can be used as a link between local and regional or national history, playing a vital and integrative role in the curriculum.

The most striking change in the history curriculum in recent years is the declining course offerings and enrollments in European and world history. European history was once the mainstay of the history curriculum. Earlier in the century many of the better high schools adopted some variation of the course sequence recommended in 1899 by the American Historical Association's Committee of Seven. It consisted of three years of European history (ancient history, medieval and modern European history, and English history) and one year of United States history and civil government.[26] (This curriculum represented a modification of one proposed earlier in the decade by the National Education Association's Committee of Ten.[27]) However, European history had lost its dominant position by 1946–47. Howard Anderson's report in that year noted a sharp decline in non-United States history enrollments over the preceding decade. The erosion appeared mainly in the year-long course in ancient and medieval history, which by then was all that remained of the three-year European history sequence. Part of that loss was made up by increased enrollments in world history, but the percentage of students taking non-U.S. history declined.[28]

Since 1947 those percentages have continued to decline. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, by 1972–73 enroll-

[24]Jack E. Cousins, "State History: The Reign of Provincialism," in C. Benjamin Cox and Bryon G. Massialas, eds., *Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967), 92.

[25]An early and highly commendable model for using state history to examine broader themes of social and economic development was the set of seventh-grade materials developed for the state of New York by Hazel W. Hertzberg, which included *Teaching a Pre-Columbian Culture: The Iroquois* (Albany: The State Education Department, 1966) and *Teaching the Age of Homespun* (Albany: The State Education Department, 1965). See also Matthew T. Downey and Fay D. Metcalf, *Colorado: Crossroads of the West* (Boulder: Pruett Press, 1976), a fourth-grade text with a social-cultural history approach; and see the history materials developed for Virginia, *Indians of Virginia* (Ashland, VA: Hanover County School Board, 1980) and *Story of Virginia* (Ashland, VA: Hanover County School Board, 1980).

[26]*The Study of History in Schools*, Report to the American Historical Association by the Committee of Seven (New York: Macmillan, 1899), 53–85.

[27]National Education Association, *Report of the Committee on Secondary Social Studies* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1893).

[28]Howard R. Anderson, *Teaching of United States History in Public High Schools*, 6.

ments in world history and all other non-United States history courses combined were only half as large as those for U.S. history courses.[29] State requirements and course offerings have also declined. "What was once a two- or three-year study involving Ancient History, British History, and European History has long ago been telescoped into a one-year World History or Western Civilization course" Douglas Alder reports. "Even that requirement has been made elective in most states. A few, like Texas, Wisconsin, Virginia and Hawaii, require some form of world studies in the high school but secondary schools in most states merely offer World History as an elective."[30] Only about 70 percent of the nation's secondary schools in 1977 even offered a course in world history.[31] This decline of world history in the curriculum may have been checked during the past decade or so, but there are few indications that it has regained very much, if any, of the lost ground.

Although world and European history have become less important in the high schools, there is no evidence of a similar decline in its elementary school equivalent. A course in world history or world cultures is widely taught at about the sixth grade. In many schools, it is the culmination of a social studies curriculum based on the notion of "expanding environments"—a curriculum that begins at the first grade by examining family and neighborhood, and then progresses through community, state, nation and hemisphere to world studies. Because students in the earlier grades may also be introduced to families and communities of other lands, they probably receive more instruction in world studies at the elementary level than in most secondary schools.[32]

In evaluating the status of history in the schools, we must also ask how history has fared compared to other school subjects. History's most immediate competitors are other social studies subjects and courses—civics, government, economics, psychology and a variety of similar, more or less closely related subjects. At the elementary level, several social studies subjects—including geography—are often combined with history in the same course, where it becomes a matter of the emphasis given to history in the social studies mixture. The question is whether history is holding its own within the social studies curriculum.

---

[29]Osterndorf and Horn, *Course Offerings, Enrollments, and Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972–73*, 35.

[30]Douglas D. Alder, "World History in the School Curriculum," unpublished paper, April 1983, 2.

[31]Weiss, *National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education*, 26, 54.

[32]Alder, "World History in the School Curriculum," 1.

A commonplace belief holds that history has not done well over the years in competition among the social studies, a view widely held within the historical profession as long ago as 1944, when the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges published its report. "There is a widespread notion that history, particularly American history, is being squeezed out of the curriculum in both the schools and the colleges," the Committee noted. "The assumed cause for this assumed calamity is the mere existence of the field of the social studies."[33] Concern about the displacement of history by the social studies surfaced again 30 years later in the Kirkendall report,[34] and still haunts the proponents of history education. Has the place of history in the curriculum been seriously eroded by the social studies?

At one time, history did have a virtual monopoloy over what became the social studies curriculum. The four-year sequence of courses recommended by the Committee of Seven left little room for complementary subjects. Its concern about education for citizenship did lead the Committee to recommend the teaching of civil government in conjunction with United States history at the twelfth grade.[35] A subsequent report by the American Historical Association's Committee of Eight called for the teaching of civics and history as allied subjects at the elementary level, with elements of geography added "to emphasize the interdependence of men—the very earliest lesson in civic instruction."[36] But it was evident from the course outlines prepared by the Committee that history was to be the dominant subject. Although the proposed curriculum was intended to serve as a model to be implemented as local circumstances permitted, portions of it were adopted by many schools.[37]

History's monopoly of the social studies curriculum was short lived. During the years following World War I, the sequence of courses recommended for the secondary schools by the AHA was gradually replaced by a new social studies curriculum which became the pattern of courses recommended in 1916 by the Committee on the Social Studies of the National Education Association. This pattern consisted of two cycles of social studies instruction: one extended from grades

[33] *American History in Schools and Colleges*, Report of the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges of the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the National Council for the Social Studies (New York: Macmillan, 1944), 59.

[34] Kirkendall, "The Status of History in the Schools," 563.

[35] *The Study of History in Schools*, 81–85.

[36] *The Study of History in the Elementary Schools*, Report to the American Historical Association by the Committee of Eight (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 116–117.

[37] Hazel Whitman Hertzberg, *Social Studies Reform, 1880–1890* (Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium, 1981), 16; Edgar B. Wesley, *Teaching the Social Studies*, 3rd ed. (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1950), 81.

seven through nine and included the teaching of geography, U.S. and European history and civics; the other included European history, United States history and Problems of American Democracy at grades ten through twelve.[38] By the 1930s, this curriculum—with a variety of social science and social problems courses grafted to it—was widely adopted by the schools. In time, a new elementary social studies curriculum also emerged, which devoted less attention to history and more to the various social environments in which the students lived.

History lost its monopoly over the social studies curriculum, but it maintained its dominant position. By the 1933–34 school year, none of the new social studies courses either individually or collectively enrolled as many students in the high schools as did courses in history.[39] While losses in enrollments occurred during the next decade in the European history sequence, they were offset by the larger numbers of students taking world history and United States history. As the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges concluded in its 1944 report, "The elimination of English history, the merging of ancient and medieval history, and the subsequent substitution of a one-year course in world history for the two-year cycle in European history do seem to imply lessened attention to the subjects. The loss is more apparent than real, however, for few students elected the two-year cycle in European history, whereas world history has become a requirement in many schools."[40] But the principal beneficiaries of the decline of the old European history curriculum were the junior and senior high school courses in United States history. Their share of student enrollments in the social studies increased dramatically between 1933–34 and 1946–47, as a growing number of state and local education agencies came to require more coursework in U.S. history.[41] The other courses in the social studies posed a much less serious threat to European history than did its U.S. history counterpart.

During the next three decades, history continued to maintain its hegemony over the social studies curriculum. The percentage of students enrolled in history courses declined somewhat during the 1960s, but United States and world history remained the two most frequently

---

[38]National Education Association, *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, Bulletin 28 (Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, 1916).

[39]In that year history courses accounted for some 60 percent of total high school social studies enrollment. Howard R. Anderson, *Teaching of United States History in Public High Schools*, 6.

[40]*American History in Schools and Colleges*, 59.

[41]The percentage of students enrolled in the social studies who were taking American history increased in grades seven and eight from 33.7 to 53.3 percent and in grades nine through twelve from 24.8 to 33.8 percent during that 13-year interval. Howard R. Anderson, *Teaching of United States History in Public High Schools*, 6.

taken social studies courses.[42] The ability of history to maintain a relatively secure place in the curriculum during the 1960s was especially impressive in a decade of social studies curriculum reform.

The New Social Studies movement of the 1960s posed what many thought was a serious threat to the place of history in the schools. This reform effort called for wider use of inductive teaching strategies and placed heavier emphasis on the social science disciplines.[43] Many of its leaders were social science educators who insisted that more attention be given to the social sciences in the schools. The subsequent proliferation of social science curriculum projects caused considerable alarm among history educators, afraid that new social science materials and courses would be introduced at the expense of history. These fears, however, were largely unfounded. The new courses in psychology, sociology and economics added to the curriculum in many schools usually displaced existing social studies courses, especially ninth-grade Civics and twelfth-grade Problems of Democracy.[44] The New Social Studies won its victories largely at the expense of the old social studies.

Although history is not in danger of being driven from the curriculum by other social studies courses, some historians have warned that history courses have been diluted with other social studies content. The report published by the Council for Basic Education concluded that students "get . . . a good deal of subjects called 'social studies,' but precious little real history."[45] The traditional subject matter of history is sometimes mixed together with other social studies content, but the extent to which this happens or has become a problem varies considerably from one grade level to another.

History is more likely to be taught in combination with other subjects at the primary and elementary levels. In social studies programs in grades one through three, history, when it appears at all, is used to illustrate the themes of family and community emphasized at those grade levels, serving as a storehouse of examples. Both United States and world history at the fifth and sixth grades are frequently taught as a combination of history and geography. Courses that integrate history and other social studies subjects are less common at the secondary school level.

---

[42]Osterndorf and Horn, *Course Offerings, Enrollments, and Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972–73*, 35.

[43]John D. Haas, *The Era of the New Social Studies* (Boulder: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies, Social Science Education and the Social Science Education Consortium, 1977).

[44]Gross, "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," 196.

[45]Howard and Mendenhall, *Making History Come Alive*, 8.

Beyond the elementary grades, integration of subjects in the social studies is the exception rather than the rule. U.S. history in both the junior and senior high schools is customarily taught as an independent subject. The content of the U.S. history textbooks used in the secondary schools is similar to that of the standard college history texts. The only important exception is world history, which is sometimes taught as an integrated course in history and geography called World Cultures. At the high school level, the integrity of the several disciplines involved in the social studies is usually preserved in a federated rather than integrated curriculum.

Whether the integration of history and other social studies subjects is detrimental to history instruction depends largely upon how the mixing of subjects is accomplished. History is by nature a synthesizing discipline. Moreover, the chronological organization of history provides a suitable framework for integrating much of the subject matter drawn from the social sciences. "Crowning them all is history, which began with the songs of bards and ends in philosophy," noted the Commission on the Social Studies in its 1932 report. "So conceived, history can furnish cement to bind all other social disciplines into a workable unity, giving to them a patterned background and, by virtue of its basic time element, a dynamic which pertains to the future."[46] But if the integration with other material is accomplished by dicing up the past and by removing people and events from their historical context, the integrity of history itself is destroyed.

It is essential that history be taught as an independent subject and not broken up into fragments to be scattered through a thematically organized or problem-centered social studies curriculum. Historical instruction provides a valuable opportunity for the student to step into another time and place and to experience it whole. The people and events of the past can only be understood when viewed within the larger context in which they existed. That is not possible when historical events or topics are isolated and extracted from the web of historic time to serve some other curricular purpose. The value of history also depends upon the chronological presentation of events through time. It is only through a chronological survey that students can begin to understand the process of social and cultural change, which is one of the principal purposes of history instruction.

How does history fare in the schools? As a sequence of courses taught from the middle grades through high school, it remains the dominant subject in the social studies curriculum. The pattern of

[46]Charles A. Beard [drafted by], *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), 18–19, 20.

enrollments and course offerings has changed from time to time, but history has endured. However, some courses have done less well than others. While history may be flourishing at one grade level, it can be in a great deal of trouble at another. That is now the case. The condition of world history at the tenth grade and United States history in the junior high schools especially deserve attention from those concerned about the future of history in the schools.

CHAPTER 2

Problem Areas in the History Curriculum

DOUGLAS D. ALDER
AND
MATTHEW T. DOWNEY

While history is not an endangered species in the school curriculum, it does have areas of weakness. Two of the traditional history courses are in trouble. The principal course in the high schools in which students are exposed to history of the world beyond the United States has undergone a gradual but persistent erosion. That part of the traditional history curriculum has shrunk from a series of courses in European history to a one-year world history course that by the late 1970s was offered in fewer and fewer schools. The junior high school course in U.S. history is also in difficulty as a declining number of schools have offered the course in recent years. Those concerned about the future of history in the schools should pay particular attention to these two areas of the history curriculum.

The most urgent need is to restore world history to its proper place in the social studies curriculum. It defies reason for the schools to continue to de-emphasize world studies when U.S. citizens find themselves thrust ever more deeply into world affairs. More citizens than ever before are traveling outside the United States, becoming involved in international trade, consuming international products, and finding themselves entangled in worldwide problems related to pollution, population growth, national security and international

political stability. The schools must do more to prepare tomorrow's citizens to live in a community larger than the nation-state. A high school course in world history that helps students understand how other societies and cultures came to be the way they are offers an indispensable part of this preparation.

What is to be done? The simplest solution is for local school districts or state education authorities to require a one-year course in world history for high school graduation. In many instances this would mean only reinstituting a requirement that once existed but was discontinued. Universities and colleges have neglected their responsibility toward world history. They could encourage schools to offer the subject by requiring it for college admission. School districts and universities that are reluctant to add still another course requirement should bear in mind that this is one method by which society demonstrates the value it places on an area of learning. In recent years world history has been decidedly undervalued.

While requiring world history will ensure it a place in the curriculum, it will not solve all of the problems associated with the world history course. From many quarters comes the message that the course now is poorly taught, is not received well by students and is confined to the unimaginative presentation of far too much data. This is as much a problem of course design as poor teaching, the result of collapsing two years of European history into one, while adding a great deal of non-European history content. Teachers of such courses are faced with trying to cover too much ground. For world history to play a vital role in the high school curriculum, some solution must be found to this "coverage" dilemma.

An examination of presently available world history textbooks for secondary schools provides an insight into the nature of this dilemma.[1] The diversity is amazing. There is little consensus about the best content for the course. The most widely used texts, those with the best format and teaching aids, are merely adaptations from earlier Western civilization texts. The rest of the world is an add-on. Single

[1]The following is a list of the secondary school world history textbooks examined here, with brief notes about their basic approach to the subject. Irving L. Gordon, *World History Review Text*, 2nd ed. (New York: Amsco School Publishers, Inc., 1979), a Western civilization approach; Daniel Roselle, *Our Common Heritage* (Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company, 1984), mainly Western civilization; Henry Abraham and Irwin Pfeffer, *Enjoying World History* (New York: Amsco School Publishers, Inc., 1977), Western civilization; Sol Holt and John R. O'Connor, *The New Exploring World History* (New York: Globe Book Company, 1977), mostly Western civilization; Mournir Farah, et al., *Global Insights* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Company, 1980), emphasizes six modern-day cultures: Chinese, Indian, Latin American, Middle Eastern, Soviet and Sub-Saharan; Philip Groisser and Henry Brun, *Mastering World History* (New York: Sadlier-Oxford Company, 1984), Western civilization, largely political and economic history; Leften Stavrianos et al., *A Global History* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), a global approach that includes much cultural geography and that heavily emphasizes the present; Bertram L. Linder, Edwin Selzer

chapters have been appended that touch upon Africa, Asia, Latin America and India. The text that most sucessfully integrates all areas through all time periods, William H. McNeill's *The Ecumene, Story of Humanity*, is seldom used because it has proved too difficult for students.[2] The decision to concentrate on Western civilization or move to a world history approach seems to hamstring publishers who want books acceptable in either adoption setting.

The authors of several texts have gambled. Some brief textbooks are inexpensive paperbacks, written in almost outline form.[3] Historians would find them seriously inadequate, but they attract some classroom teachers who want them for students who read very little. One text, for example, considers Africa without including anything on Sub-Saharan Africa before Imperialism.

Another widely adopted but highly controversial approach emphasizing world cultures rather than world history is best represented by the textbook written by Leften Stavrianos and others.[4] Instead of limiting the scope of world history, this text expands it to include world geography as well. The authors treat Western civilization as one cultural tradition among equals. For historians, the difficulty with this approach is that the historical material presented for each world region is necessarily truncated—sometimes with damaging consequences to historical sensibilities. For example, World War II is reduced to one page and the Holocaust to one sentence. The Nazis are portrayed without mentioning the concept of totalitarianism. A sense of continuity and causality is severely undermined in this book, partly because the general tone is highly presentist.

An examination of world history textbooks used in the elementary grades suggests the range of options for course design at that level. Most of the books adhere to the "widening worlds" curriculum concept upon which most elementary school social studies programs are based. In this scheme of things, students begin in the first grade studying the family and proceed in later years to the neighborhood, the community, the nation and the world. These texts also wed

and Barry M. Berk, *A World History* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1983), a global approach; T. Walter Walbank, et al., *History and Life, The World and Its People*, 2nd ed. (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company, 1984), Western civilization, with some attention to Africa, Asia and Islamic countries; Edward R. Kolerzon, *The Afro-Asian World* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), mostly contemporary; Marvin Perry, *Unfinished Journey: A World History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983), Western civilization with sections on Asia, Africa, Islam and the Americas; William H. McNeill, *The Ecumene, Story of Humanity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), history of the major civilizations; Carl Becker and Ken Cooper, *Modern History* (Cincinnati: Silver Burdett, 1984), an old classic; Anatole G. Mazour, et al., *Peoples and Nations: A World History* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983), another classic that is still in print.

[2]William H. McNeill, *The Ecumene, Story of Humanity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).

[3]Philip Groisser and Henry Brun, *Mastering World History*.

[4]Leften Stavrianos et al., *A Global History*.

history and geography. The elementary world history textbooks usually reflect a world, rather than a Western civilization emphasis. While historians would consider some of these textbooks too presentist, others include both ancient and medieval history. The historical content throughout is severely compressed (sometimes only a single page is allocated for the entire history of a nation), but the books are interesting and often include documents and case studies. Because they do not attempt to be inclusive and because they are clear in their purpose, the elementary textbooks are usually more successful in achieving their goals than are their secondary school counterparts.[5]

Admittedly, it is easy to criticize textbooks. All sorts of single-issue lobbies make textbooks into targets. As a result, textbook adoption in school systems is becoming highly politicized when it should be mainly a pedagogical process. Consequently, historians will likely be critical of even the best world history texts. They will notice that an awareness of up-to-date social history or quantification studies are largely missing. The consideration of women is sparse. However, most textbooks have moved beyond strictly political history, to include economics, arts, science and religion.

Some world history texts try to involve students in the subject material by including short documents for students to analyze or, more often, biographies that may stir their interest.[6] Although virtually all texts include vocabulary and question exercises, most books are largely didactic; teachers often find them obstacles to student motivation. The large number of color visuals, charts and timelines is a notable improvement in the last decade for which publishers must be congratulated, especially considering the very competitive pricing situation they face.

What the world history course needs is an adequate conceptual base. The previous concept of "coverage," starting with ancient people and moving chronologically through time to the present, is impossible to sustain. Anyone attempting to do this either omits most of history by default or moves so rapidly that each epoch and each

[5]Among the elementary school textbooks in world history examined here are the following: Robert A. Carter, et al., *You—World & Cultures* (Westchester: Benefice Press, 1979), examines Europe, Africa, Asia and Oceana; John P. Augelli, *American Neighbors* (Grand Rapids, MI: Fideler, 1982), includes Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean and South America; Susan Dye Lee, *Eastern Hemisphere* (Chicago: Follett Publishers, 1983), a historical survey of Western civilization with a survey of modern-day Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe; Susan Dye Lee, *Latin America and Canada* (Chicago: Follett Publishers, 1983), a social science approach, not chronological; Cleo Cherryholmes and Gary Mensch, *Investigating Societies* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1979), includes the sociology, geography, politics and history of Europe, China, Africa and South America; Peter Ferry, ed., *The World Now and Then* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1980), a chronological approach, with heavy emphasis on recent times.

[6]Daniel Roselle, *Our Common Heritage* especially its "Let's Meet the People" sections; Bertram Linder et al., *A World History*, uses case studies and simplified documents extensively.

civilization can only receive cursory attention. It is obvious that the course needs rethinking, in respect both to structure and to what students should be expected to learn.

There is currently no universal concept or model for a high school world history course. Perhaps world history should be taught from a variety of perspectives. The students' ethnic backgrounds, the school's geographical location, the teacher's preparation and the available materials may all suggest different ways to approach world history courses. Yet it would seem that all world history courses should have some essential content, some persistent intellectual concerns. These are not evident in the world history curriculum today.

A concentration on Western civilization has several conceptual advantages. It helps the majority of students discover their own heritage, their own identity. The study of Western civilization can also be personally useful for students whose ethnic origins lie beyond Europe. They are involved in the culture of the West, as well as that derived from their other ethnic roots, and may to a greater or lesser extent share its values. A Western civilization approach has the advantage of being able to focus on one culture, starting at the beginning and moving chronologically toward the present. Thus it can emphasize narrative mode, continuity and causality.

The plea to move away from a concentration on Western civilization to a genuine world view also enjoys powerful normative arguments. Instead of discovering only their own Western heritage, students should learn to appreciate other cultures as well. The increasing interdependence of the world's nations suggests that students need an international awareness. They need to know about cultures other than those of the West if the United States is to compete economically with Japan, Korea and other non-Western nations. Other normative arguments include positions on the urgency of peace, the danger of nuclear war, the crises in pollution and population—none of which can be solved by one nation. Despite the power of these pleas for a world focus in the curriculum, one must find solutions for problems that will arise if one abandons the chronological-causality-continuity approach central to historical study.

The principal problem that teachers face is how to decide which topics and themes to leave out. Curriculum specialists and materials developers need to be explicit in stating concepts and rationales to help guide teachers in what to teach and what to set aside. Among the present alternatives are the following:

1. Continue with Western civilization—the focus should be on

the general American heritage as an outgrowth of European history. Emphasize a sense of continuity.

2. Focus on the whole history of the whole world but be selective, based on the teacher's training and the students' background.
3. Use a comparative approach, studying Western civilization but comparing each stage of it with selected cultures. The continuity would remain with Western civilization but no continuity would be attempted with the contrasting emphasis. Perhaps it could be retained by comparing just two cultures.
4. Build a curriculum around the theme of cities and urbanization.
5. Design a curriculum around the theme of modernization.
6. Develop a curriculum along anthropological lines: study two or three pastoral (traditional) societies, followed by two or three agricultural societies (Ancient Greece, Medieval China, Medieval Europe, for example), and conclude with two or three industrial societies (such as Industrial England or Modern Japan).

It is also important not to focus on content questions only. Students in world history courses must also learn how to think critically, how to evaluate documents, how to generalize, how to synthesize, and how to look for causality and continuity as well as change. The process of the historian's craft should be made explicit. The course should not just present data.

If teachers in U.S. high schools are to teach a world history course, they must have some preparation for it in their college experience. It is possible now for teachers to graduate with practically no coursework in world history. This is especially the case for those who choose a social science composite program. Teachers should complete a Western civilization or world history survey course and some upper-division work outside of United States history. Knowledge of at least one non-Western and one European culture should be a minimum requirement.

United States history in the junior high schools faces a situation somewhat analogous to that of world history. The course should be restored to its former status by once again requiring all students to take it. But that would not solve the problem that has made the course vulnerable in the first place: the fact that the course is too similar to the eleventh-grade U.S. history course that follows it. Teachers complain that students are bored with the eleventh-grade United States history course because they have already covered the material when they were in junior high school. As a student in Providence, Rhode Island, remarked, "You can only hear about the Civil War so many

times. American history does not go back very far, so you have to study the same stuff over and over again.'"[7] The charge of repetition is the Achilles' heel of junior high school United States history. Trying to make space in the curriculum for other subjects, schools find it tempting to eliminate the course in the name of avoiding "needless repetition" or duplication of instruction.

U.S. history courses in the schools are repetitious, especially at the secondary level. It is less noticeable at the elementary level, where the course tends to pay greater attention to geography, to emphasize social rather than political history, and to focus on the events of everyday life. However, a sampling of secondary school textbooks (and textbooks do largely determine course organization)[8] reveals a great deal of overlapping content. While the eleventh-grade texts are much larger than the junior high texts and include a greater variety of content, they contain a good deal of the same information. For the period from the Civil War to World War I, for example, texts at both levels are likely to include the history of Reconstruction; the growth of U.S. industry and the rise of big business; politics in the Gilded Age, including an account of the overthrow of the Tweed Ring; the rise of the Populist party; the coming of the Spanish-American War; and the history of the Progressive movement.[9] Students at the eleventh grade are expected to relearn a great deal of material to which they have been exposed before.

Although the charge of repetition of content is valid, it is a somewhat curious complaint. Repetition appears to be a problem only in reference to history courses. Content in other school subjects is reviewed year after year as student learning is reinforced by repetition. It is one of the most widely observed principles of learning in the schools. Yet the schools do not discontinue English or mathematics instruction in the junior high schools because students are bored by once again having to relearn the rules of grammar or the method of long division. The question is not whether United States history courses

[7]Quoted in Barbara Tucker Corvone, "Student Attitudes Toward Studying History," *The Clearing House*, 57 (December 1983), 164.

[8]Karen B. Wiley, *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955–1975* 3 vols. (Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1977), Vol. 3, 80–81.

[9]The secondary school U.S. history texts examined here included the following: (junior high school) L. JoAnne Buggey, Gerald A. Danzer, Charles L. Mitsakos and C. Frederick Risinger, *America! America!* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1982); Richard A. Bartless, Clair W. Keller, and Helen H. Carey, *Freedom's Trail* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981), Margaret Stimmann Branson, *America's Heritage* (Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company, 1982); (senior high school) Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curti, *Rise of the American Nation* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1982); James West Davidson and Mark H. Lytle, *The United States: A History of the Republic* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981); Daniel J. Boorstin and Brooks Mather Kelley, with Ruth Frankel Boorstin, *A History of the United States* (Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company, 1981).

in the secondary schools are repetitious, but why that view is so widely perceived as a problem.

The reason, one suspects, is that a great many secondary students find that much of the content being repeated is uninteresting and largely meaningless. U.S. history textbooks, especially those written for the secondary schools, heavily emphasize events and developments remote from the experience of most students. It is difficult enough for mature adults to grasp the importance of Andrew Jackson's war against the Second Bank of the United States or of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. Yet adolescents, whose lives and experience are much more circumscribed, are expected to understand the meaning of such measures and events after reading only a brief textbook account. Junior high school students who come away from such a task bewildered and bored are likely to be bored again when they encounter the same content in high school. The basic flaw is not repetition; it is the repeated encounter with a history that has little meaning to students struggling to learn it.

Eliminating United States history in the junior high schools is not a constructive solution. The problem is not that students know so much about U.S. history that they can afford to devote a third less time to it over the course of their school years. Neither is it a question of removing the U.S. history course from the junior high schools to make room for other social studies subjects. The schools are more likely to use time once given to United States history to teach mathematics or science, causing a net loss to the social studies. But the most important consideration is the students, who will not understand history better by being exposed to it less.

The remedy is to do a better job of adjusting content in U.S. history courses to fit students' ages, needs and abilities. To inundate adolescents with the history of national institutions is senseless. They need a history closer to home, one more directly related to their own experience, a history focusing on the events and experiences of everyday life, while relating such matters to the larger social and economic developments of the past. That is, the students' encounter with the past in the junior high schools should reinforce and build upon the history they learned in the lower grades while anticipating the conceptually more difficult national history that is to come later in high school. There is little evidence, at least in the U.S. history textbooks available to junior high school students, that the history curriculum is designed to do this at present.

The U.S. history textbooks written for junior high school students tend to be condensed versions of high school textbooks built around

a core of political and economic history. Although the vocabulary is simpler and the reading easier than in high school texts, little else has been done to address these books to young adolescents. They do not build upon the students' previous historical learning. Instead of trying to build bridges between what they already know and the more remote and complex affairs of national history, the books tend to provide only an uninteresting and fragmentary synopsis of the latter. Students are plunged into the distant world of national politics and big corporations, diplomacy and wars, without any assistance in relating these larger developments to the nearby world with which they do have experience. History textbooks designed expressly for this age group remain to be written.

The most noteworthy effort in recent times to tailor history courses to the different age levels of students was the proposal made in 1944 by the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges.[10] In its report, the Committee explicitly addressed the problem of repetition in course content, especially at the senior high school level "where the course is often practically indistinguishable from that given in Grade VII or VIII."[11] The Committee's solution was to make the existing U.S. history courses more sharply differentiated in respect to content, chronology and study skills.

The Committee was especially concerned that the content of United States history correspond to students' interests and level of intellectual maturity. It suggested that the elementary course be mainly concerned about how people lived, the junior high course with how the nation grew and the high school course with the American people in a world setting. The scheme was intended to make sure that "more difficult topics are allocated to higher school levels. . . ."[12] The Committee further recommended that the methods used to present the material also be appropriate to the level of the students' intellectual development, "graduated from simple narrative, through descriptive accounts, and on into interpretation and synthesis."[13]

The Committee also proposed giving each of the three United States history courses its own chronological emphasis. In its design, the elementary course was weighted heavily toward the early period of the nation's history, while the junior high course concentrated on the years from 1776 to 1876. The high school course primarily empha-

[10] *American History in Schools and Colleges*, The Report of the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges of The American Historical Association, The Mississippi Valley Historical Association, The National Council for the Social Studies (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944).
[11] Ibid., 68.
[12] Ibid., 79.
[13] Ibid., [illegible]

sized the period from the Civil War to the present, but it also reviewed earlier periods and was expected to provide a synthesis and an interpretation to the sweep of United States history.

Finally, the Committee recommended the teaching of skills appropriate to the several levels of the history curriculum. These ranged from instruction in the reading of simple maps at the elementary level to the making of comparisons and distinctions on the basis of historical evidence in the high school course. Again, the guiding principle was to teach skills compatible with the level of a student's intellectual development.[14]

The recommendations of the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges did not go entirely unheeded. In the years following the publication of its report, state departments of education did make an effort to reduce the chronological duplication of United States history courses. In a review of state curriculum guides in 1963, Bernice Stiles Wade found that about half the new state guides issued during the previous five years directed schools to give greater attention to the pre-Civil War period in the eighth-grade course and to place more emphasis in the eleventh-grade course on the period from the Civil War to the present.[15] A perusal of several recently published U.S. history textbooks suggests that publishers also have paid some attention to chronological differentiation. The fifth-grade texts examined here emphasized the colonial and early national periods, with about three fourths of the pages given to the period prior to the Civil War.[16] The junior high school textbooks that the author consulted concentrated on the period from 1776 to 1900, although they included a review of the colonial period and a brief treatment of more recent history. The senior high school textbooks emphasized the period after 1860, with about 40 percent of the pages devoted to the 20th century.[17] Despite considerable overlap, the courses offer distinctly different chronological emphases.

It is lamentable that textbook publishers and curriculum developers have not paid greater attention to recommendations made by the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges. The only proposal considered at the secondary school level is the chronolog-

[14]Ibid., 71–72.

[15]Bernice Stiles Wade, "A Study of Recent Changes in the Social Studies Program of the Public Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1964, 137, 139.

[16]The elementary textbooks included: Gertrude Stephens Brown, with Ernest W. Tiegs and Fay Adams, *The Country* (Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company, 1963); Allen Y. King, Ida Dennis and Florence Potter, *The United States and Other Americas* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1982); Timothy M. Helmus, Val E. Arnsdorf, Edgar A. Toppin and Norman J. G. Pounds, *The United States and Its Neighbors* (Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett Company, 1984).

[17]The secondary school United States history textbooks are listed in footnote 9.

ical differentiation that the committee recommended. That is a solid gain, because the narrowing of chronology does relieve the pressure on teachers to cover all of U.S. history at each grade level. It also provides time to study some topics in sufficient depth to stimulate student interest, but far too little progress has been made in tailoring content in U.S. history courses to the level of student maturity.

The only course that seems to have been designed with students of a particular age level in mind is the one at the elementary level. These textbooks tend to emphasize social history and cultural geography—that is, the everyday life of the people in the United States and the physical environment in which they lived. The content is not excessively removed from the children's own experience, and it deals with concrete and tangible aspects of history. These texts would be even more effective if they more often introduced students to the experiences of children in the past. At least elementary students are generally provided with a history about adults that they can visualize and understand.

The senior high school U.S. history course has traditionally served as the capstone of the history curriculum. Its purpose is to present students with an overview of the nation's history, a synthesis that gives meaning to the American past. In recent years the course has tended to emphasize the 20th century, or at least the period after the Civil War. But it includes enough of the more distant U.S. past to give students a sense of historical development over a substantial period of time.

This is not to say that secondary school United States history has remained unchanged over the years. The eleventh-grade course today is substantially different from its equivalent of 40 years ago. In reviewing state and local curriculum guides produced during the period 1955 to 1975, Karen B. Wiley noted that "the 11th grade American history course has been transformed from one with a primarily political orientation to a study of many aspects of the country's social, economic, and cultural development."[18] The transformation is also evident in the changes in eleventh grade history textbooks. Although political history still plays a conspicuous role in these texts, it is no longer their major preoccupation. The textbooks still fail to give adequate attention to some aspects of United States history,[19] but they are a substantial improvement over texts used by earlier generations. Pressures from special interest groups and shifting fashions of his-

[18]Wiley, *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955–1976*, Vol. 3, 30–31.

[19]Francis FitzGerald, *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1979), 110.

torical scholarship have led especially to increased attention to the history of racial and ethnic minorities and of women. Today's high school students are more likely to find something of interest between the covers of the textbook simply because a more varied history is there. However, the texts do assume a level of intellectual maturity and an ability to grasp the more distant and abstract dimensions of national history beyond that attained by many students. But students ultimately must face this challenge. Unfortunately, their struggle to bring together the disparate pieces of the American past into some coherent and meaningful whole would not be quite so diffficult had their preceding history courses led gradually and logically to this culminating course in U.S. history.

Restoring world history to its former place in the high schools and U.S. history to its place in the junior high schools are the major challenges facing those concerned about history in the schools. Both courses should be made state or local requirements, but requiring the courses will not by itself be sufficient. Both suffer from persistent problems deeply rooted in the past, problems that can only be resolved by a concerted effort from all the groups and interests involved in history education. In the immediate future, much of the burden will rest upon classroom teachers. The teachers of world history must grapple with the dilemma of coverage versus selectivity. Junior high school teachers of U.S. history must find ways to relate events and developments of national history to what their students already know and are concerned about. But others must come to their aid. The universities must help train teachers to meet these challenges, and publishers must provide new materials that teachers will need. State and local educational agencies must be willing to assist teachers by providing the time and financial resources they will need to mount an adequate effort. The vitality of history in the schools will depend in the future as it has in the past upon the cooperation of this community of interests.

CHAPTER 3

Students, Methods and Materials of Instruction

HAZEL W. HERTZBERG

The purposes of teaching history should inform the content selected, the methods by which it is taught, and the materials used to teach it. The three seminal national reports that shaped the high school social studies curriculum—the NEA Committee of Ten (1893), the AHA Committee of Seven (1899) and the NEA Committee on the Social Studies (1916)—were quite clear on this point. The reports firmly linked purpose, content, method and materials of instruction with each other and with the developmental needs and capacities of students. These linkages, which reflected classroom realities as well as ideals, help to account for the enormous influence of the reports. Future improvements in the teaching of history will necessarily be based not simply on strengthening each of these constituent elements of the art of teaching but on recognizing and clarifying their interdependence.

History came into the high school to serve a public purpose: education for citizenship. It spread rapidly throughout the public schools in the first two decades of this century at a time when the idea of the public or common good was a dominant theme in political and social reform. More than any other school subject (except its ally, civics, which also appears in such guises as government or law), history was and is bound to a commitment to the idea of the public good and to the education of citizens who will further it. Definition of the public

good changes and is often unclear, but the idea of a public entity beyond the fortunes of individuals or groups underlies all school history, whether local, national, regional or global. The role of the effective citizen also changes and is often unclear. The most obvious role is a political one, but in school it frequently includes the social and economic citizen as well.

Basic to all these conceptions is the principle that the individual is acting in a public rather than a private capacity. When the idea of the public good is demeaned and when people lose confidence either in the possibility of affecting the behavior of citizens through education or in the ability of citizens to affect change, school history is weakened. We are living through such a period today, but significant countervailing forces include the growth of popular interest in history, which is part of a deep need people feel for continuity and coherence. School history has to take account of all these tendencies as it continues to carry out its proud legacy of furthering the public good and the education of citizens.

The nature of history itself provides some guidance in fulfilling the basic purposes of history teaching. Unlike any of the other social subjects, history deals with change through time. As the AHA Committee of Seven put it, students "should be led to see that society is in movement, that what one sees about him is not the eternal but the transient, and that in the process of change virtue must be militant if it is to be triumphant."[1]

Three aspects of examining change through time are especially significant for school history.

The first leads students to enter into other times and places to see how the past looked to the people living in it. This involves learning the choices open to them, how and why they made these choices and with what results; experiencing the conflicts of the past from the perspective of the parties to the conflicts; understanding something of the common context of events that people living during that time simply took for granted; and grasping relationships among different aspects of a particular period. To do all this, students need to encounter not just broad impersonal forces but men and women whose lives exemplify the great continuities and changes of their time.

The historical imagination, which the story of history should cultivate, develops not just through reading or hearing about statements about the past but through acquiring for oneself a sense of the concrete circumstances of life—its sights, sounds, smells, tastes, textures. Stu-

[1]American Historical Association, Committee of Seven, *The Study of History in Schools* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899), 19.

dents need to use all their senses in gaining an understanding and feeling for the past. Teachers should ask themselves what students need to experience beyond a historical narrative to bring alive the history they are studying: how the abstract can be made concrete and immediate without destroying its historical integrity.

Given enough time, it is not too difficult to recreate people, place and period so that students understand reasonably well how the past looked to the people living in it. Obviously all school history cannot be dealt with in this way. Only periods truly significant for the purposes of history teaching should be selected for such treatment. It is also desirable to select periods that can be fruitfully compared. Perhaps a conceptual base can be built by an intensive study of one period that can then be more generally applied to others. Every history class needs some time during the year to develop this type of historical base.

A second aspect of change through time was described by the Committee of Seven as "the relation of cause and effect, as cause and effect appear in human affairs." The Committee pointed out that "history has to do with the becoming of past events—not simply with what was, but with what came to be. . . ." Students "begin quite unconsciously to see that events do not simply succeed each other in time, but that one grows out of another, or rather out of a combination of others."[2] If students are to achieve an understanding of cause and effect, a chronological organization of material is essential.

The cultivation of judgment about cause and effect is one of the most important tasks of history teaching in its contribution to the education of citizens. The curriculum should be so organized as to further this process and should certainly not impede it. It is a distinct disservice to students to imply, by arranging the curriculum without reference to chronology, that cause and effect do not exist or that the past did not have a life of its own but is summoned up merely to illustrate contemporary interests.

Long-term historical development is the third aspect of change through time. It is not only the most difficult to handle, but it also poses the problem most commonly encountered by teachers of school history—a problem widely ignored. Synthesis involving the sweep of centuries is a challenge of virtually no interest to most historians today. It has a low priority in graduate training, and almost no dissertations attempt it. Few historians as part of their recognized professional work write books that encompass what is ordinarily covered in a high school history course. There are thus few models on which

[2]Ibid., 21–22.

to draw. Yet synthesis is exactly what we need in survey courses that comprise most of the secondary school curriculum if they are to be more than an accumulation of unrelated events.

It is not sufficiently recognized that high school history teachers must deal with one of the most difficult conceptual problems. They do so with minimal help from the rest of the historical profession. The tendency within the profession to define the production of new knowledge and new interpretations based on that knowledge as the highest type of historical inquiry casts synthesis in an inferior light. I am not arguing that specialization is undesirable or unproductive but rather that a fundamental aspect of history is now being neglected.

Perhaps the first thing to do about this problem is to recognize that it exists and that it is not insoluble. The search for synthesis in itself would, I suspect, help to raise major historical questions that specialization obscures. If even a few institutions made the search for synthesis a basic part of their research and instructional program, we would begin to see results that would spill over into history teaching.

Closely related to examining the questions of change through time are three other characteristics of historical inquiry that have played a significant role in school instruction.

The first deals with historical interpretation. Historians have long advocated that students should learn something about the nature of history so that they will be better equipped to judge the material they study. They need to learn to distinguish clearly between the past and history. They should come to understand that, while the past is irrevocable and cannot be changed, the way we look at the past (that is, its history) can and does change in the light of new evidence, new societal concerns and differing frames of reference on the part of historians. Thus a variety of interpretations of the past is possible, indeed inevitable. But to be valid, an interpretation must account for all available evidence, not simply evidence selected to support an interpretation. The development of the ability to understand the changing nature of historical interpretation and the uses and misuses of evidence is one of the major contributions school history can make to the education of citizens.

The second characteristic involves the use of primary source materials. "Source study," or the use of sources in the teaching of history, was a popular method of teaching history in the late 19th century, a high school version of the German seminar paralleling the introduction of the seminar method of source use in college and university teaching. Many books of source materials were published following the turn of the century. The leading advocate of the use of primary

sources during the first half of the 20th century was Henry Johnson, whose *Teaching of History* was probably the most influential methods textbook before World War II and whose student and successor at Teachers College, Columbia, Erling Hunt, was the first editor of *Social Education*. Source study was rediscovered in the 1960s by the New Social Studies movement, which unknowingly tapped into this very old tradition. A recent National Science Foundation report revealed that source study was a minor but still significant part of the study of history. In 4 percent of the classrooms surveyed in grades ten to twelve in 1977, copies of original documents were used more than 50 days and in 19 percent between 10 and 50 days, less frequently than in grades seven to nine but still indicating a respectable attention to primary materials.[3]

Source study is advocated as a way to bring the past vividly alive, to understand how the historian works and how a historical narrative is created, and to develop skills needed in dealing with evidence. The critical use of sources is one of the most exciting and rewarding ways of doing history, provided that sources are carefully selected and balanced, comprehensible (unfortunately, many important sources are not) and subjected to critical review. A wide variety of sources can be drawn upon: letters, diaries and newspaper accounts as well as official documents, which are often more difficult to comprehend. Buildings and other artifacts from the past can also be examined. Students can do oral history interviews and thus create new primary sources for analysis. There is no better way for students to learn why there are different interpretations in history than through the sources. All this takes time, and the time-consuming nature of source use is probably its worst enemy.

Any method can be misused. Students have sometimes been asked to make global interpretations from a few extracts or have been given the erroneous impression that historians write history solely on the basis of primary sources without reference to secondary literature. The Committee of Seven in advocating the judicious use of sources warned about their misuse. This warning still holds good.[4]

While differing interpretations can be used in any history course, primary sources can be employed most extensively either in the study of a particular period or in local history. It is probably in local history that the sources have been most widely and successfully used. The tendency to shift local and state history from junior high school to

[3]Iris R. Weiss, *Report of the 1977 National Survey of Science, Mathematics and Social Studies Education* (Research Triangle Park, NC: Center for Research and Education), B90, B91.

[4]Committee of Seven, 101–110.

the fourth grade is unfortunate because it eliminates the rather sophisticated use of sources that is possible in junior high school and can lay the basis for deeper historical understanding in succeeding grades.

A third characteristic of history important to the school is its close relationship to both the humanities and the social sciences. It was this characteristic that linked history in the curricular wars of the late 19th century to both the "classics" and the "moderns" and helped historians to play a central role in curriculum reform. This dual linkage still has profound implications for history instruction. History can and does incorporate a good deal of material from the social sciences and can thus serve as a curricular synthesizer. At the same time, history's link with the humanities, neglected during the era of the New Social Studies, offers the possibility to include material from art, literature, music and architecture. The revitalization of history's humanistic tradition in the schools could not only offer course content but also serve as a base for combining the teaching of history with the teaching of writing.

What is the significance of all this for the student? Almost everyone agrees in theory that content, methods and materials of instruction have to be selected with an eye to the developmental level of students and to their needs and interests. It is extraordinary how often this wisdom is ignored. While we have a good deal of knowledge about adolescence in general, we have much less knowledge about what used to be called "the psychology of school subjects." Social studies teachers often remark on the differences in students between two grades, such as grades seven or eight and ten or eleven. Such differences, which teachers believe profoundly affect instruction, deserve systematic study.

Teachers and other adults have often observed that students have great difficulty locating and placing in sequence the events in time that lie beyond their own experience. They even have difficulty placing such events as the Great Depression, World War II, the civil rights and antiwar movements of the 1960s, and the Watergate scandal that live vividly in the minds of older generations. Because history is so fundamentally involved with time, we obviously need to know much more than we do now about the relationship between the development of temporal conceptions in adolescence and student attitudes toward and conceptions of history. But we really do not need research to tell us that many of our students are hostile or indifferent toward the past and its history. There may be a better reason for these attitudes than we have supposed. A students' relationship to the past is a deeply personal matter.

Each culture has its own conceptions of time, which the people living in it accept as part of the natural order of things. In complex societies with various subcultures and classes, several conceptions of time may exist side by side. The author's tentative explanation of the problems many American teenagers have with the past and with history may be briefly summarized as follows. In adolescence, young people, as Erik H. Erikson says, struggle with and find new identities. In doing so, they confront the problem of the past—their own and the historical past. In the quest for independence from childhood and parents, an adolescent, in Erikson's words, "begins to develop that sense of historical irreversibility which can lead to what we may call acute historical estrangement."[5] One manifestation of this process is the "generation gap," in which the experiences of the parental generation are often seen as so different and remote from the present as to be both irrelevant and hostile to the adolescent's attempts to become independent. Another is the phenomenon of "role moratorium," in which young persons play with the many possibilities they now see open to them, testing one and then another in their search for the one to which they can commit themselves. They try on these roles, often committing themselves passionately to one, then dropping it abruptly to pursue another. From the adolescent's viewpoint, time, in effect, stands still while this process takes place in an all-enveloping present. In traditional societies there is often a period in which the young person can experiment without lasting consequences or commitment, but the time is brief and the available roles highly limited. In a technologically developed society such as ours, however, adolescence is much longer and the number of available role possibilities is much greater. The process of testing them can be bewildering, sometimes agonizing. The young person, who lives in a timeless present in which nothing is irrevocable and who assumes a past that can be altered at will, experiments with the idea that time is reversible while becoming increasingly aware that it is not.

It seems likely that adolescent struggles with time and attempts to develop more sophisticated temporal conceptions are essential parts of the major changes in cognitive structures that take place during adolescence. The temporal conceptions of secondary school students generally go from the concrete to the abstract, although there are varying phases in which the development is quite uneven, sometimes seeming to reverse itself.[6] To enter fully into a complex temporal

[5]Erik H. Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity," in E. H. Erikson, ed., *Youth: Change and Challenge* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), 346.

[6]A. Gessell, F. I. Ilg and L. B. Ames, *Youth: The Years from Ten to Sixteen* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1956), 448–450.

world is a difficult process, one much more difficult than is generally recognized.[7]

Few things hold promise of contributing more to improving the teaching of history than investigations of students' conceptions of historical time. There is a small but fascinating body of work on which to build, most of it done in England. One of the earliest and most interesting investigations, by E. C. Oakden and Mary Sturt in "The Development of the Knowledge of Time in Children"—an article published in 1922—showed that up until about 11 years of age, "conventional names of time periods, especially dates, have little meaning unless they are definitely explained and correlated with the child's own activities." Children seem to notice chiefly what people in bygone ages had *not*, the investigators reported, "rather than what they *had*," suggesting that contrast is easier to grasp than similarity. Oakden and Sturt also reported that "little ability to conceive of continuity and development is apparent up to the age of 11"; that "in many elementary school children there was a tendency to place epochs, events, and people in the order in which they had appeared in the child's own consciousness, and not in the real chronological order"; and that "primitive and early historical periods appear to be most interesting to children," perhaps because they do not have to deal with present temporal complexities.[8] In general, these findings have been confirmed by a number of other studies.[9]

The development of historical time conceptions in adolescence has been less intensively studied. In a tentative summary of the research, the British social psychologist Gustav Johoda suggests that in pre-adolescents, the year is the significant present time, last year is the past that can be present in mind and produces effect, and next year is the anticipated future modifying present action. At this stage,

---

[7]Hazel W. Hertzberg, "The Teaching of History" in Michael Kammen, ed., *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1980), 192–193. See also Hertzberg, "Alienation from the Past: Time, Adolescence and History" (paper, Teachers Conference on History in the Schools, 1977) for an analysis linking historical and cultural time with adolescence.

[8]E. C. Oakden and Mary Sturt, "The Development of the Knowledge of Time in Children," *British Journal of Psychology*, 12 (April 1922), 335–336.

[9]For a review of the literature see Gustav Johoda, "Children's Concepts of Time and History," *Educational Review* (February 1963), 87–104. See also M. L. Harrison, "The Nature and Development of Concepts of Time Among Young Children," *Elementary School Journal*, 34 (February, 1983), 507–514; Frederick Pistor, "How Time Concepts Are Acquired by Children," *Elementary Method* (November 1940); N. C. Bradley, "The Growth of the Knowledge of Time in Children of School Age," *British Journal of Psychology*, 38 (December 1947) 67–78; Barbel Inhelder and Jean Piaget, *The Growth of Logical Thinking From Childhood to Adolescence* (New York: Basic Books, 1958); Donald Thompson, "Some Psychological Aspects of History Teaching," in W. H. Burston and C. W. Green, eds., *Handbook for History Teachers*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1972); John B. Poster "The Birth of the Past: Children's Perception of Historical Time," *History Teacher*, 6 (August 1373), 587–98.

"interest in historical sequences develops in [the] following order: biological (seed, plant, harvest): technical (ships, engines): and cultural (period of stagecoaches, Bronze Age). . . . Isolated, realistic details [are] placed in their historical framework (interests in museums)" and children are interested in historical tales and novels. In adolescence, "this period of life" is the significant present, five years ago and five years hence is significant past and future. There is interest in the continuous development of one person or period," and in the "psychological motives of past actions."[10]

One of the few recent American studies of the connection between adolescence and history, by Martin Sleeper, was based on students competent in history. Sleeper found that these adolescents hold history in two different mental compartments; one, a lively and powerful sense of the past having to do with one's own personal development, and the other—formal history—worth studying but without personal relevance and meaning, in which thinking is far less speculative and hypothetical. These two come together only through the perception of a particular event that seems salient to both the individual and the societal past.[11]

These studies all have obvious relevance to the teaching of history. Yet few curricula have attempted to incorporate their findings or to use different conceptions of time in different cultures as a way of addressing the problem of matching curriculum and content with student needs and interests. But it can be done, as the author sought to show in the seventh-grade units that she developed, which use as fundamental organizing categories patterns of time and space.[12]

It is unrealistic—even cruel—to ask students to learn something that is so essential and intrinsic to their growth and to give them so little help in doing so. If students are struggling with evolving temporal conceptions, can we not help them? Can we not enlist history to help them understand their own temporal struggles and their own relationships to society, not by superficial references to current events or the latest version of "relevance," but by a deeper matching of historical study and the profound temporal concerns of adolescence? It may well be that the particular combination of the concrete and the abstract offers unique opportunities in this regard.

---

[10]Gustav Johoda, "Children's Concepts of Time and History," 100–101.

[11]Martin E. Sleeper, "The Uses of History in Adolescence," *Youth and Society*, IV (1973), 259–274, and "A Development Framework for History Education in Adolescence," *School Review*, LXXXIV (1975), 91–107.

[12]Hazel W. Hertzberg, *Teaching a Pre-Columbian Culture: The Iroquois* (Albany: The University of the State of New York, State Education Department, 1966); *Teaching of the Age of Homespun* (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1965); *The Great Tree and the Longhouse: The Culture of the Iroquois* (New York: Macmillan, 1966).

If the historic purpose of history teaching is the education of citizens, the historic method is the recitation, and the historic material is the textbook. The recitation and the textbook dominate not only in the social studies classroom but in most others as well.

The recitation involves varying techniques. It is always controlled by the teacher and always consists of questions and answers, but beyond that it may range from a catechism, in which almost verbatim repetition of the textbook is expected, to an open and free-flowing discussion. The most common form of instruction in high school social studies classes today is the discussion form of recitation supplemented chiefly by lecture.

Reformers have long excoriated both the textbook and the recitation. Interestingly enough, however, the three earlier mentioned great committees that shaped the social studies all advocated the use of textbooks. Of course, they wanted good textbooks, and they urged the use of a variety of supplementary materials. Similarly, the Ten and the Seven specifically endorsed the recitation, while at the same time warning against its rote memorization, rapid-fire question-and-answer guise. They strongly recommended that other methods be used as well. The 1916 NEA Committee did not discuss the recitation directly but it gave exemplary lessons, which are clearly discussion/recitation.

Neither the recitation nor the lecture has been popular with social studies reformers for well over half a century, yet the methods flourish. Does the recitation have some positive evolutionary value, some qualities that social studies teachers find useful, as James E. Hoetker and William Ahlbrand, Jr., have suggested?[13] What merit do teachers find in the lecture?

Let us first consider some explanation for the persistence of the recitation. It is an excellent method for mastering factual information, and most teachers believe that acquisition of facts is important. It is a convenient method for monitoring student progress. The recitation puts the teacher in control. It ensures student participation, and most teachers believe in student participation. They see it as culturally consistent with our society and appropriate to the public discussion that is an essential part of the democratic process. Contrary to the claims of its critics, the recitation/discussion is flexible and can be used for inquiry, discovery and problem-solving. (What else is the Socratic method?)

Many teachers believe that straight lecturing is culturally inappro-

[13] James E. Hoetker and William Ahlbrand, Jr., "The Persistence of the Recitation," *AERA Journal*, 6 (March 1969), 145–167.

priate. They think that it is resented by students and that its overuse may result in behavior problems. In spite of such misgivings, however, social studies teachers lecture at least once a week in almost half the country's grade ten to twelve classrooms and every day in almost a third.[14] Unfortunately, the National Science Foundation study from which these figures are taken does not tell us how much of the period is typically consumed by lecture. On the basis of extensive observation, however, the author suspects that the social studies high school lecture ordinarily lasts from ten to twenty minutes.

Why does this method persist when it is so universally condemned by reformers and is viewed by many teachers with such mixed feelings? Probably the most important reason is that it is an effective method to give students, quickly and concisely, information not included in the textbook. History teachers are under pressure to "cover" a great deal of material, and the lecture is one way to provide the coverage with the kind of information and interpretations the teacher thinks important. It is a way to ensure that the class has a common body of knowledge other than that gained from instructional materials, and it can lay the basis for further discussion. It is also a way for the teacher to tailor material to the needs of a particular class. Thus the lecture gives the teacher considerable flexibility.

The third most extensively used methods in grades ten to twelve social studies classes are individual assignments and student reports or projects. This is consistent with teachers' beliefs that students should learn to work on their own and that some instruction should be individualized. About a third of the class time is devoted either to students working individually or, about half as often, in small groups.

These are the major methods used in the social studies classroom. Others that are fairly common are library work, simulations (role-play, debates, panels), and brainstorming. Some methods are seldom employed. It is a rare social studies classroom where students use computers or programmed instruction, contracts, manipulative or laboratory materials, or even work at the blackboard.[15]

The pattern of method that emerges is fairly clear, and it is so persistent that it is not likely to be easily changed. Rather than condemning the discussion/lecture/individual-and-group work triad, it would make more sense to try to work within it and improve it. The purposes of history teaching outlined above can be accomplished, I believe, within the general pattern that exists or with some partial

[14]Weiss, *Report of the 1977 National Survey of Science, Mathematics and Social Studies Education*, B67.

[15]Weiss, ibid., B67.

but not drastic modification of it. They cannot be accomplished, however, unless classroom methods are used inventively, appropriately and well.

It should be emphasized that method is much more complex than the question of whether one uses the lecture, the recitation or individual-and-group work. These are generalized forms. At every point, method and content interpenetrate each other. Method involves many of the same problems of selection, emphasis, dramatization and deletion that writing history does. It is essential for teachers to know their subject well, not because that will automatically make them better teachers (we all know fine scholars who cannot teach), but because without that knowledge they cannot make judgments that good teaching requires. Method is to teaching history what style is to writing it.

My own conclusion is that if history is to have deep and lasting meaning to students, they must make it their own. This requires active participatory learning, not the passive and grudging acquisition of names and dates or "one damn first after another" of which history teaching is often accused. Each of the triad of methods can, when purposefully and imaginatively used, involve active learning. For example, the lecture, which seems on the surface to offer the fewest opportunities, can have a dramatic structure to which the student responds, can raise significant questions, and can lay out clashing interpretations for students to consider. On the other hand, individualized instruction, which seems to offer many more possibilities than the lecture for independent and active learning, may in fact consist only of such humdrum activities as filling in blanks on a worksheet. Much depends on the teacher's conception of how students learn and on the teacher's ability and willingness to plan lessons carefully so that active learning results.

The most commonplace instructional material in any classroom is the textbook. Its most important functions are that it provides a course of study and common materials. It also demonstrates a balance among the various topics to be studied, thereby suggesting the amount of time to be spend on each; gives suggested readings; raises questions about the materials; and is useful for summary and review. These are substantial virtues.

Nevertheless, there are many problems with texts. The lack of available synthesis is fundamental to the poor quality of many texts. They tend to be intellectually thin, paying insufficient attention to long-term historical development and to the reality of conflict. Most textbooks lack incident, drama and enough concrete detail to bring the past to life. They rarely give more than one interpretation, although

there is practically no important development about which there are not at least two well-founded interpretations.

United States history textbooks suffer from particular problems. They seldom admit the existence of national self-interest, thereby denying it legitimacy. Their recent treatment of race and ethnicity, in reaction to past deficiencies, emphasizes victimization, discrimination and prejudice. As a study of recent textbooks warned:

> Ultimately, when textbooks portray the history of ethnic groups as a repeated struggle between victims and oppressors—between subject and dominant peoples—the central processes that integrated American society are trivialized. Since the textbooks dwell on ethnic groups as antagonists, the new history fails to show their joint participation in historical movements that created a fluid and pluralistic social system. . . . In concentrating narrowly on ethnic conflict, the new history slights the forces that have created common bases of group experience and group interests that transcended ethnic lines.[16]

Stylistically most textbooks are bland and boring, speaking a manufactured textbook language. They are often assembled rather than written. The problem of textbook style is deeper than it might first appear. Peter Gay's comments in *Style in History* may be applied equally to texts.

> What should prevent the historian from offering his findings in the dry, deliberately graceless manner of a paper, say, in clinical psychology, is not literary aversion but recognition that such a mode of presentation would not be merely less delightful than a disciplined narrative—it would also be less true. Style is the art of the historian's science.[17]

When textbooks clump along using Dick and Jane language or, what is even worse, language that deliberately obscures, they are less true.

The writing of a textbook does not necessarily arise out of a desire to educate the school children of the United States or to spread the good word of history. As the historian Irwin Unger candidly put it in a paper describing his adventures in writing a U.S. history college text:

> Nobody I know has written a textbook except for money. Let us get that straight right at the beginning. One may come to like the thing as it goes well; one may learn an enormous amount by the time one is finished. But I have never met anyone who has committed two or three years of his personal and professional life to a survey text unless energized by the ultimate lure of greed.[18]

---

[16]Nathan Glazer and Reed Ueda, *Ethnic Groups in History Textbooks* (Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1983), 61.

[17]Peter Gay, *Style in History* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), 212.

[18]Irwin Unger, "The Adventures (and Misadventures) of a Text Book Author," *The History Teacher*, 16 (February 1983), 201.

Fortunately, the worth of a book does not depend on the motivations of the person or persons who wrote it, otherwise many splendid books would be worthless and many worthless ones splendid. What is disturbing is that the kind of accountability that exists in other professional writing simply does not exist for textbooks. Among historians they are regarded as non-books from a professional viewpoint, which includes such concerns as promotion and tenure. They are simply not taken seriously. Textbook writers may well take pride in what they produce, but they may also tolerate interference that they would not dream of tolerating in "real" writing. Of course, this may also stem from the need for advice that they may feel in writing for young readers about whom they know little.

Other reasons account for the often low textbook quality, including state adoption systems, pressures from special interest groups, the lack of a code of ethics for textbook writers and publishers, and more general trends towards conglomerates in the publishing industry. Matthew Downey summed up the situation succinctly, "While ostensibly an educational and intellectual undertaking, publishing a textbook is in reality a commercial venture and an exercise in interest-group politics."[19]

Since there is little question that textbooks will continue to be the major instructional material in history classes, we need to find ways to improve their quality. One obvious course is to see to it that textbooks are reviewed and evaluated in the historical and educational journals by competent authorities. In most journals the only attention given to high school textbooks is through paid advertising. A survey of the *American Historical Review*, the *Journal of American History*, the *History Teacher*, *Social Education* and *Social Studies* for the past three years showed that there were no reviews in the *AHR* and the *JAH*, although both carried high school textbook ads, and only a few small reviews in *Social Studies* and *Social Education*. The only serious attempts at textbook reviewing were in the *History Teacher*. None published the type of long, critical analysis that is essential if textbooks are to be given consideration commensurate with their influence. Such reviews must combine an analysis of subject matter and of pedagogy.

The practice of regular, authoritative reviewing might lead to a code of ethics so badly needed in the textbook field. Today the role of the authors, consultants, editors, ghost writers and other profes-

[19]Matthew T. Downey, "Speaking of Textbooks: Putting Pressure on the Publishers," *The History Teacher*, 14 (November 1980), 61. Downey's article contains excellent suggestions for textbook improvement.

sionals is often unclear and rarely subjected to critical analysis. It might be worth attempting to evolve a more formal code of ethics for participation in the writing of texts.

Another way to improve textbooks might be to turn them over to a group of publishers who have a built-in interest in high academic competence—the university presses. Distribution might be handled through agreement with commercial publishers.

The most common instructional materials in addition to the textbook are reference books, globes, maps, charts, filmstrips and films. Somewhat less frequently used are paperbacks, the overhead projector, photographs and position papers, records and copies of original documents. All of these except paperbacks are much more likely to be found in classrooms in grades seven to nine than in ten to twelve, which is unfortunate considering how valuable such materials can be in bringing history to life.[20]

Several decades ago, television was touted as the instructional medium of the future. Today standard and closed circuit TV are used in only a few social studies classrooms. It is too early to tell whether the computer, which is currently celebrated in education much as television was earlier, will meet a similar fate. The social studies "software" produced so far is of poor quality. Whatever the computer's use in formal school instruction, however, it is likely to have an impact on the way people think and perceive the world as fateful as television's, which seems to have profoundly affected people's sense of time and history, an effect not yet well understood. For many years, social studies educators ignored the societal and psychological impact of television and therefore did not help their students learn to deal with it. We should not make the same mistake with the computer.

The national dialogue about education now under way opens the opportunity for a national effort to improve the teaching of history. Whether or not this improvement actually takes place will depend on what we think needs to be done as well as on the resources the country is willing to commit to doing it. Concentrating on only one or two elements of the art of teaching—at present the favorite seems to be upgrading teacher's knowledge of content—is necessary but it is not sufficient. It is a simplistic solution to a complex problem. All the elements of the art of teaching history and, above all, their interconnections have to be addressed. Because real teachers in real classrooms with real students know that good teaching necessarily involves

[20]Weiss, *Report of the 1977 National Survey of Science, Mathematics and Social Studies Education*, B90, B91, B78, B79.

them all, defining good teaching in terms of only one or two elements denigrates the art of teaching in the eyes of those who practice it. The best teachers know this best.

The improvement of history teaching in the schools is not just desirable: it is a national necessity. History has a quality unique among school subjects. There is a fateful correspondence between the role of history in the education of citizens, and its role in the maturation of the individual. The public face of history turns outward toward the student's roles in society; the private face looks inward to their unfolding mental powers. In no other school subject is there such an extraordinary relationship between the imperatives of society, subject and individual growth.

CHAPTER 4

Preparation and Certification of History Teachers

CLAIR W. KELLER

In the teaching of history as in every other academic subject, the teacher is a critical factor. The surest guarantee of good history teaching is to staff the schools with skillful, knowledgeable and well-trained history teachers. The old saying that mathematics, language and science teaching require special expertise, but that anyone can teach history has long been discredited. "The unwarranted assumption that any one who can read can teach history explains its unpopularity in some schools," noted the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges in 1944. "It should be clearly recognized that the historical knowledge which might be acceptable for a general education is woefully inadequate for a teacher of American history."[1] The question is what skills, knowledge and training should history teachers have and how should colleges and universities, state departments of education, and school boards make sure that they have them?

We must acknowledge at the outset that not all of the attributes of a good history teacher can be acquired in a formal training program.

[1]Edgar Wesley, Ed., *American History in Schools and Colleges* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), 94–95. This is the report of a joint committee of the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association (later the Organization of American Historians) and the National Council for the Social Studies.

Teaching is not a mechanical art. The good history teacher must have enthusiasm for the subject, sympathetic understanding of students and perseverance—virtues not necessarily acquired through college coursework. Yet even the most naturally gifted teachers need an adequate knowledge of the subject and exposure to the variety of materials and methods available for teaching it.

In preparing history teachers, subject matter knowledge should not be too narrowly defined. A teacher must have a solid general education to teach a subject as eclectic as history. This should include a broad background in science and the humanities, as well as in history and the social sciences. Humanities training should include a foreign language as well as English literature and the arts. Written communication skills and English language mastery are also essential. Prospective teachers certainly need more than one year of English composition in college if they are to acquire what one scholar has described as "an active care for language."[2] Furthermore, research has clearly shown a connection between the ability to think clearly and to write clearly.[3]

One might assume that college history majors have ample opportunities to develop writing skills, but this is not always the case. Too many written assignments in college courses are term papers turned in at the end of the course. Designed to fulfill course requirements, they do not instruct students in writing. In fact, completing written assignments without close supervision may actually reinforce poor writing. History teachers must also learn how to use and evaluate different types of writing assignments.

General education should mean more than the acquisition of general knowledge through a series of survey courses. Arthur Bestor, a founder of the Council for Basic Education and a critic of teacher education in the 1950s, wrote nearly 30 years ago that "an unhealthy appetite for survey courses is one symptom of educational distemper. Liberal education seeks to develop general intellectual ability rather than narrow vocational competence, but it does not do so by spending

[2]Peter Pouncey, "On a Background for Teachers," *Against Mediocrity: The Humanities in America's High Schools* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1984), 135–137; James Howard and Thomas Mendenhall, *Making History Come Alive* (Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 1982), 41–42; the report from Twentieth Century Task Force urged that the federal government clearly state that the most important objective of elementary and secondary education in the United States is the development of literacy in the English language, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 25 (May 11, 1983), 6.

[3]A. E. Berthoff, *Forming/Thinking/Writing: The Composing Imagination* (Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden, 1978); J. Emig, *The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders*, Research Report No. 13 (Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1971). Several of the recent studies emphasized this point. See, for example, Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983), 176.

its time on mere generalities."[4] Survey courses, when they consist only of lectures, foster passive learning because they usually provide little opportunity for intellectual exchange. Students should have to grapple with a few important books in English literature, for example, rather than merely sampling many works. Survey courses ought to be offered as a culminating experience to enable students to put the pieces together.

Teachers of history in the schools should have an adequate background in history and the social sciences. Secondary school teachers should have the equivalent of a major in history or at least 30 semester hours supplemented by courses in political science and economics. In a 1983 brochure, *Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers*, the Teaching Division of the American Historical Association recommended that secondary school social studies teachers have at least 12 semester hours of advanced undergraduate work in U.S. history in addition to the basic survey courses. It emphasized United States history because the majority of teachers will be required to teach the United States history survey course.[5] Because many are asked to teach the world history survey course as well, they should also take advanced-level courses in history other than that of the United States. In addition to introductory surveys and advanced undergraduate lecture courses, future teachers should take at least one seminar emphasizing historiography and historical methods. They should know how to analyze and compare historical interpretations and how to locate and critically use primary sources.

College and university history departments must assume a larger share of the task of preparing future history teachers. Few departments of history take this responsibility seriously. They must do more than just recommend that prospective teachers take history courses. They must also be concerned about how those history courses are taught. Some evidence suggests that the way a teacher was taught is more likely to influence his or her teaching style than what was learned in methods courses on teaching.[6] If so, prospective teachers need exposure to more varied teaching styles than one finds in most history departments. Lecturing should not be the only teaching method

---

[4]Arthur Bestor, *The Restoration of Learning: A Program for Redeeming the Unfulfilled Promise of American Education* (New York: Knopf, 1955), 253.

[5]Donald B. Cole and Thomas Pressly, *Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers*, 3rd ed. (Washington, DC: The American Historical Association, 1983), 13.

[6]Karen B. Wiley and Jeanne Race, *The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education: 1955–1975* (Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1978), 39; see also John I. Goodlad, "A Study of Schooling: Some Findings and Hypotheses," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64 (March 1983), 469.

that the future history teacher encounters.

Future teachers also need help synthesizing fragments of information learned from various history courses. Most secondary school history teachers are expected to teach the traditional year-long chronological course in United States or world history, but few have had any training in how to conceptualize such a course. It is no wonder that teachers rely so heavily on history textbooks in their classrooms.[7] At present, history departments do little beyond the example provided by their own introductory survey courses to help prospective teachers integrate the fragments of their history coursework into a meaningful whole.

One useful approach to accomplish this synthesis is to have students take an upper-level independent study course that requires them to develop a course syllabus on either U.S. or world history that compares in quality and scope to a senior thesis. This syllabus might consist of topics and subtopics for daily lessons, student assignments, an annotated bibliography of resources—such as books, films, simulations, computer software—and evaluation methods. Students should be required to defend their course outline as part of a written or oral examination.

The foregoing recommendations for undergraduate preparation of secondary teachers should also serve for elementary teachers, except that elementary teachers should place a heavier emphasis in the area of mathematics, including computer literacy, and the natural sciences. Because much of the elementary social studies curriculum consists of cultural geography, the social science concentration should emphasize anthropology, cultural and physical geography, and sociology rather than economics and political science. Elementary teachers who will be called upon to teach history should have a minimum preparation of 15 semester hours that includes United States and world history, as well as courses in Third World and in local history. Guidelines under consideration, but yet to be adopted by the National Council for the Social Studies, recommend that 15 percent of a student's course work be in social sciences and history for teachers in self-contained classrooms and 25 percent for teachers specializing in social studies subjects in departmentalized schools.[8] Elementary teachers should take at least one methods class in social studies.

An undergraduate preparing to become a history teacher should also have some exposure to the theoretical and practical aspects of

[7] J. P. Shaver, O. L. Davis, Jr., and S. W. Helburn, "The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies," *Social Education*, 43 (February 1979), 151.

[8] National Council for the Social Studies, Proposed Teacher Education Standards for Social Studies (unpublished draft), May 1983.

teaching. Although education courses have received a great deal of criticism over the years, often with ample justification, some professional training is indispensable. Critics have also tended to exaggerate the amount of time prospective teachers spend in such courses. The National Commission on Excellence in Education, for example, lamented that teacher preparation "is weighted heavily in the courses in 'educational methods' at the expense of courses in subjects to be taught." It cited a survey that indicated that 41 percent of an elementary education student's time was spent taking education courses. The report, however, neglected to mention that secondary education candidates spend far less time than that in professional courses.[9] Most teacher preparation programs at the secondary level devote less than 20 percent of an undergraduate's total coursework to educational courses. Much of that work, in turn, involves practice teaching and classroom observation, both of which are of considerable value to the future teacher.

How much time should a prospective history teacher be expected to devote to professional training? Guidelines under consideration by the National Council for the Social Studies recommend that 20 percent of an undergraduate program consist of coursework in the philosophy of education, educational psychology, teaching methods and practice teaching.[10] That may not be excessive, if the emphasis is clearly placed on practice teaching. Even the social studies methods course should be directed toward practice teaching. In those schools where the methods class directly precedes student teaching and where student teaching assignments are known, students in the methods class should prepare materials that can be used during student teaching. Although the number of education courses have been declining until recently, new demands for special training in such areas as multicultural/nonsexist education and special education have created increased professional requirements. Care must be taken to see that the new demands are not automatically translated into "add-ons," since it is possible that instruction in these areas of concern can be met by including them as part of existing courses.

---

[9]National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A National at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, U.S. Department of Education (1983), 22. See also, Marge Schere, "Who's Afraid of Teacher Competency Tests?" *Instructor*, 42 (February 1983), 48–51; Chester Finn, Jr., "Teacher Politics," *Commentary*, 75 (February 1983), 29–41; National Task Force on Education for Economic Growth; for an exception see, Boyer, *High School*. The report argues that "there is important information uniquely relevant for teachers" (pp. 175–176).

[10]National Council for the Social Studies, Proposed Teacher Education Standards for Social Studies, unpublished draft (May 1983), 17; The Carnegie Foundation study of the U.S. high school excluded social studies methods probably because it also advocated fifth-year apprentice system in lieu of the traditional practice teaching. Boyer, *High School*, 176.

State education agencies attempt to ensure a minimum level of competency for beginning history teachers by establishing certification requirements. Usually the requirement consists of a specific number of credit hours in history that a candidate must have completed before being certified to teach the subject. Several states set no specific standards. Instead, a state board or certification agency decides whether or not to approve teacher-training programs submitted to it by the state's colleges and universities. However, 36 states do list specific credit requirements in history and other subjects, with the history requirement ranging from five to 24 semester hours. All 36 specify some work in United States history, with a mean of seven semester hours; 33 require credits in world history, with a mean of six semester hours.[11] Thus it is possible to teach U.S. and world history in many states with minimum preparation, and, in some states, world history can be taught by teachers with no preparation.

The greatest threat to quality history teaching so far as certification requirements are concerned is the growing trend toward issuing generic social studies certificates. These enable teachers who have accumulated a certain number of credit hours in the social sciences and the humanities to teach any one of several social studies subjects. While some states have minimum requirements in each subject area, others do not. Thus, a teacher holding a generic certificate may be able to teach history with very little or no coursework in the field. It seems that only one state, Illinois, does not permit the issuing of generic social studies certificates. Thirty-six states provide both generic and specialty certificates, while the remainder rely on generic certificates alone. The movement toward generic certification in the social studies seems to be an anomaly. Other teaching fields in recent years have seen a proliferation of specialty certificates. But, as Eva C. Galambos has noted in a study of teacher certification in the United States, "this has not been the trend in social studies for . . . approximately one-third of the states use a single comprehensive social studies certificate. Few states, however, use this generic approach when it comes to the natural sciences."[12]

The principal advocates of generic certificates are local school boards and school principals. They cite such advantages as flexibility in scheduling and the need for broad preparation to teach in the high school. They discount the importance of the knowledge explosion that makes it difficult to prepare individuals who can master broad

[11]Tom Weible and Wayne Dumas, "Secondary Teacher Certification in Fifty States," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33 (July/August 1982), 22–23.

[12]Eva C. Galambos, "Certificates in Georgia with Comparisons for Other States," unpublished study (Atlanta, 1981), 4.

areas and the danger of assigning teachers to areas in which they are unprepared to teach.[13] They probably also recognize the use of specialized certificates implies, as Galambos notes, "a degree of distrust by the State of local superintendents and principals. If each local school leader could be trusted not to assign a teacher to a subject for which preparation is inadequate, comprehensive certificates would be ideal."[14] A study on the status of history in Iowa indicates that the state's distrust is warranted.[15] But pressures have been placed on state certification agencies to use the comprehensive generic certificate, especially in states faced with declining enrollments. The strong relationship between coaching and social studies, especially physical education majors with minimum preparation in the social studies, also contributes significantly to poor history teaching.[16]

Prospective teachers face a dilemma when choosing between a generic social studies certificate or a concentration in history. If a student chooses to concentrate in history, job prospects will be limited to those schools, usually large urban or suburban schools, where enrollments are sufficient to assign teachers to only history classes. These are usually choice positions, and competition, if it exists, would be keen. New teachers are likely to be assigned, even in these schools, to what is left, while teachers with experience and seniority hold the better assignments. Jobs, if they exist, are likely to be found in small rural schools with only one social studies teacher. It is not unusual for such teachers to teach five subjects and coach, as some of my graduates have, three sports. One does not really prepare for such positions, one merely survives. Consequently, the prospective teacher must prepare not for the ideal position but for the reality of the job market.

Generic social studies certificates that do not require at least 12 semester hours to teach a subject should be abandoned. U.S. history and world/non-Western history should be considered as separate subject fields for certification. Prospective teachers should be encouraged to major in history, splitting coursework between United States and world history. The AHA's Teaching Division has proposed that a major be 33 semester hours including several hours of world/non-Western history. This seems adequate. The proposed NCSS guidelines recommend "in-depth analysis, study, intensive reading, and research and writing in any field to be taught," and also recommend

[13]Ibid., 33–34.

[14]Ibid., 34.

[15]William E. Carroll et al., "The Teaching of History in the Public High Schools of Iowa," unpublished report (August 1979), 22–26.

[16]Ibid., 55; see also, Robert T. Wessel, "Athletics and Their Effect on Female Teachers in the Public Schools in Iowa," *Iowa State Journal of Research*, 55 (February 1981), 245–253.

that preparation in social studies total about 40 or 50 semester hours. The guidelines also specify U.S. and Western/non-Western history as separate fields.[17]

Elementary teacher certification should also include a minimum requirement in U.S. history and in world history. Teachers in self-contained classrooms should have at least six semester hours in United States history and six semester hours in Western or non-Western history. Teachers in departmentalized schools should have nine semester hours in world history including one course in a Third World area. These suggestions fall within the proposed NCSS guidelines but go somewhat further by specifying history rather than social studies.

Strengthening certification requirements will have little or no effect on teachers already in the classrooms. States seldom, if ever, require teachers already holding certificates to meet new standards. Moreover, teacher organizations have resisted the retroactive application of standards that would require their members to take additional coursework.[18] As fewer newly trained social studies teachers obtain teaching positions than in years past, the preparation of those actually teaching may vary a great deal from established standards.

If states do not raise certification standards, we will have to rely more heavily upon tests of teacher competency to ensure an acceptable quality of history teaching in the schools. Indeed, the rapid growth of competency testing during the past decade itself suggests an increasing public concern about teacher competence.[19] Some states already require competency testing in teaching specialties. Several of the recent reports on education have recommended wider use of such exams.[20]

If properly constructed, competency examinations could have the advantage of directing undergraduate education toward acquiring knowledge and skills rather than toward accumulating grades and credits. While one might acknowledge the limitations of examina-

---

[17]Cole and Pressly, *Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers*, 13; National Council for the Social Studies, Proposed Teacher Education Standards for Social Studies (unpublished draft), May 1983, 19.

[18]The Delaware Board of Education was recently forced to rescind the high teacher-recertification standards it passed in September 1982. *Education Week*, 2 (February 2, 1983), 3. Eighty percent of a sample poll of Oklahoma teachers, for example, disagreed with a requirement to pass competency tests in subject area every few years. Richard Simms, "Attitude of Teachers Toward House Bill 1706," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (March/April, 1983), 26.

[19]J. T. Sandefur, "Teacher Competency Assessment Plans 'Little Short of Phenomenal,' " *AACTE Briefs*, 3 (November 1982), 8–9, 11. The exact number and nature of the examinations is not clear. The survey cited here uses the term "academic."

[20]Boyer, *High School*, 180; also *A Nation at Risk*, 30.

tions in determining who will become good teachers (no exam on methodology should be considered), there seems little doubt that an examination could be devised and administered to determine whether or not a prospective teacher had acquired sufficient knowledge for teaching United States or world history.[21] Besides determining competency in history, the exam could also test for the ability to write and think. For that reason, the greater part of such examinations should consist of essay questions, but they should also test for an understanding of historiography and the ability to use primary sources in the classroom as well as for subject matter knowledge. It would be well if those taking such examinations received scores other than pass and fail. The addition of at least an "outstanding pass" might lead administrators to look more favorably upon applicants with such scores. Both secondary and elementary teachers should be expected to pass such examinations in states that require them, although the elementary teachers' exam should be more general in nature and need not include historiography questions.

While it is important to raise certification standards for new teachers, the major challenge is to provide more adequate inservice training for teachers already in the classrooms. The quality of inservice training is especially important during eras of retrenchment, such as the present, when fewer new teachers are being hired. Inservice programs, however, must be planned with the full cooperation and participation of the teachers themselves.[22] Teachers have traditionally had considerable influence in determining how a school district's inservice requirements are met. Collective bargaining agreements have often limited what additional education school districts can require of teachers.[23] Even the number and timing of professional days are negotiated. Closer cooperation between college departments of history and local school districts would help provide the sharp focus recommended in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching report on secondary education. Cooperation must be one of genuine interaction so that inservice courses not only reflect teacher needs but eliminate what the report describes as universities' "plantation mentality." The report even encourages universities to adopt

[21]See Chester Finn, Jr., "Teacher Politics," *Commentary*, 64 (February 1983), 31; Marleen C. Pugach and James D. Raths, "Testing Teachers: Analysis and Recommendations," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (January/February, 1983), 4.

[22]James Lytle, "Investment Options for Inservice Teacher Training," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (January/February 1983), 28–31.

[23]See *Education Week*, 2 (February 2, 1983), 3 for a discussion of opposition by Delaware teachers against high recertification requirements.

schools to establish one-to-one connections.[24]

School districts that are serious about inservice training and have identified a specific need might better use teacher time and energy by placing inservice instruction in the school day, perhaps meeting half a day for several weeks. When specific content areas have been identified, the inservice training can then be geared more closely to each teacher's class situation. This allows teachers to implement ideas between inservice sessions and to give the inservice instructor immediate feedback. It also points out the importance that school districts place on inservice training.

Inservice courses for secondary teachers should encourage the exchange of ideas and develop critical thinking. Reading and sharing ideas from a number of historical works, for example, would seem to be a useful inservice course. A course entitled "New Interpretations of United States History" would help teachers update knowledge of new works.[25] If each course member reads a different book or article, it becomes possible to share ideas. Each teacher can accumulate knowledge of many works. In another course, teachers could read and then share a variety of biographies, memoirs, diaries or some type of primary source related to a specific event or period. This type of inservice course would not necessarily require a college instructor. Teachers could take turns selecting, perhaps even acquiring if necessary, the books and/or articles needed for each session.

History preparation of elementary teachers is usually weaker than that of secondary teachers. Therefore, for them, inservice courses should attempt to fill content gaps. Because there seems to be a trend toward teaching more local history, inservice courses could explore resources available for teaching about community history. Data on early inhabitants could be gathered and shared, and photos could be obtained from older residents. Early newspapers could be read. History of the Third World, upon which many social studies programs are based, also presents unlimited opportunities for reading and shar-

[24]Boyer, *High School*, 264–267; Yale University has been involved in a cooperative program with the New Haven School District since 1975 and was evidently the model for Boyer's suggestion. See Doris L. Eder, "The Reinvigoration of School Teachers," *Yale Alumni Magazine*, 47 (April 1984), 23–25. The idea is catching on. The Hewlett Foundation recently funded a more modest program to be directed by the author and Professor Kermit Hall, University of Florida. This program consists of two pilot projects conducted between the University of Florida and Alachua County School District and Iowa State University and Des Moines School Districts. It provides for year-long seminars held during the school day. Another program involving the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the Riverside High School started last summer. See Beverly T. Watkins, "Joint Project with University Aimed at Revitalizing High Schools," *Chronicle of High Education*, 28 (May 16, 1984), 1, 14–15.

[25]For a description of one such course, see Stephen R. Luchene and Benjamin Milner, "Great Books Make Great Teachers," *American Educator*, 6 (Winter 1982), 16–19.

ing numerous works. Novels by Third World authors, for example, would provide an excellent reading list for an inservice course.

Because many school districts count only graduate college credits toward salary increases, many teachers enroll in graduate programs. Such courses ought to be related to the teacher's field. One way to encourage teachers to enroll in graduate programs is for colleges and universities to offer master's degrees that concentrate on broad content acquisition and methodology rather than on the more narrowly focused traditional master's degree. School districts can also encourage graduate work in fields related to a teacher's classroom situation by specifying that a salary credit be given only for those courses that relate to a teacher's classroom experience.

The ideal master's degree for teachers should provide both methodology and content, because such coursework should be more in tune with a classroom teacher's class assignment. Rather than focusing on a single discipline, master's degrees should enable teachers, especially elementary teachers, to be interdisciplinary. This does not mean a degree that omits research but one that directs research toward broad topics that receive considerable attention at the high school and elementary level.

INDEX

A

Africa, 15.
American Historical Association (AHA), ix, 8; teaching division, 43, 47.
Antiwar movement of 1960s, 30.
Arkansas, 3.
Asia, ix, 15.

B

Bethany College, Pennsylvania, viii.
Boston Conference on the Status of History in the Schools (Nov. 22, 1982), vi, ix.
Boulder, Colorado, viii.

C

California, ix.
Canada, 5.
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 49.
Cause and effect, 15–18, 27–28.
Central America, 5.
Central Michigan University, viii.
Chronological presentation, 11, 16, 17, 21–22, 27, 32, 44.
Citizenship, education for, 8, 14, 25–27, 34, 40.
Civil rights movement of 1960s, 30.
Civil War, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23.
CLIO project, California, viii.
Colorado, University of, iv, ix.
Columbia University, iv, ix, 29.
Commission on the Social Studies report (1932), 11.
Committee of Eight (AHA) report (1910), 8.
Committee of Seven (AHA) recommendations (1899), vi, 6, 8, 25–27, 29, 34.
Committee of Ten (NEA) report (1893), 6, 25, 34.
Committee on American history in Schools and Colleges report (1944), 8, 9, 21–22, 41.
Committee on the Social Studies (NEA), recommendation (1916), 8, 25, 34.
Computers, use in teaching, 35, 39.
Council for Basic Education, 2, 10, 42.

D

Depression, the Great, 30.

E

England, 32.
Ethnic minorities, 17, 23, 37.

G

Generic social studies certificates, 46–47.
German seminar method, 28.
Gilded Age, 19.

H

Hawaii, 7.
History, purpose of, 11, 25–26, 34.
History versus social studies, ix, 2, 3, 7–12.
Holocaust, 15.
Humanities, history's relationship to, 30.
Hunt, Erling, 29.

I

Illinois, 46.
India, 15.
Iowa, 3, 47.

J

Jackson, Andrew, 20.
Japan, 17, 18.
Johnson, Henry, 29.

K

Korea, 17.

L

Latin America, 15.
Lecture as a teaching method, 34–36, 43.

M
Mexico, 5.
Michigan State University, ix.
Montana, 3.

N
National Center for Education Statistics report (1976), 2, 6.
National Commission on Excellence in Education, 45.
National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), iv, v, ix, 44, 45, 47–48.
National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), v, vii, ix, x.
National Science Foundation report, 29, 35.
Nazis, 15.
New Social Studies movement (1960s), 10, 29, 30.
Nuclear war, danger of, 17.

O
Organization of American Historians report (1975), 2.

P
Pennsylvania, viii.
Populist party, 19.
Progressive movement, 19.

R
Recitation as a teaching method, 34.
Reconstruction, 19.
Repetition of course content, 4, 5, 18–20.
Research Triangle Institute (RTI) survey (1979), 2–3.
Rhode Island, Providence, 18.
"Role moratorium" phenomenon in young people, 31.

S
Science and mathematics versus history, viii, 1.
South America, 5.
Spanish-American war, 19.
Source study, 28–29.
Special Interest Group for History Teachers (SIGHT, NCSS affiliate), iv, v, ix.
Student reports as a teaching method, 35–36.
Synthesis and interpretation of history, 11, 21, 27–28, 30, 36, 44.

T
Teacher training, x, 18, 24, 41–51.
Television, use in teaching, 39.
Temporal conceptions of adolescence, 30.
Texas, 7.
Textbooks, history, 5, 11, 14–17, 20, 22–24, 29, 34–39.
Totalitarianism, 15.
Tweed Ring, 19.

U
United States Constitution, ix.
United States Office of Education survey (1946–47), 3.

V
Virginia, 7.

W
Watergate scandal, 30.
West Virginia, 3.
Western civilization, advantages of stressing, 17, 18.
Wilson, Woodrow, Fourteen Points, 20.
Wisconsin, 7.
Women in history, 16, 23.
World history courses, erosion of, 14, 15.
World War I, 8, 19.
World War II, 4, 15, 30.

National Council for the Social Studies
Publications Staff
Charles R. Rivera, *Director of Publications*
Anne Janney, *Associate Editor*
Kirk Stone, *Associate Editor*
Jeanne Mannix, *Publications Secretary*

Mildred Edwards, Indexer, *Proofreader*
Cover Design by Del Harrod, Design Network, Inc.